
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2025

by AJ Steen BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/D/25/3367780

The Meadows, Little Park Farm, Marchants Close, Hurstpierpoint, West Sussex BN6 9UZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss Emma Poland against the decision of Mid Sussex District Council.
 - The application Ref is DM/25/0785.
 - The development proposed is proposed pitched roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I note that the description of development in the decision notice was more detailed than that on the application form. It also refers to a new gabled dormer on the existing roof slope of the dwelling that is shown on the submitted drawings. For clarity, I have used the description of development on the application form above but have considered the new dormer in my reasoning.

3. In determining this appeal involving a listed building or its setting I have had special regard to section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - Whether the proposed works would preserve the Grade II* listed building known as Little Park Farmhouse or its setting or any features of special architectural and historic interest (or significance) which it possesses; and
 - The effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area

Reasons

Setting of Little Park Farmhouse

5. Little Park Farmhouse, listed Grade II*, comprises a large house within substantial grounds on the edge of Hurstpierpoint. To the south and west of the listed building, between it and the centre of the village, is more modern development. The Meadows is to the north-east, on the opposite side of the listed building and beyond which is public open space. It was constructed in the early to mid 17th century of brick with 2 storeys

and an attic, and Horsham slab roof. It has 2 shaped Dutch gables and massive chimney breast. There is another brick chimney breast to the elevation facing Trinity Road, away from The Meadows, through which there is a door.

6. The listed building is located up the hill, over a pond and with the barn referred to above separating it from The Meadows. The Meadows is located on land that would have formed a farmyard with functional and visual links to Little Park Farmhouse and retains some of that rural character. The Meadows is set into the slope of the land, with the building on a substantial level area with bank around the rear and sides beyond which the land rises up.

7. The significance of the Farmhouse as a heritage asset is its historic and architectural interest, with particular regard to its surviving historic fabric, materials and construction. In addition, its setting contributes to that significance, comprising substantial grounds and relationship with the surrounding countryside, including with the former farmyard in which The Meadows is located and open space beyond.

8. There are views across The Meadows from the public open space toward Little Park Farmhouse. However, these are restricted by the boundary treatment and mature trees. In addition, the topography means that The Meadows is set lower than the public open space and Little Park Farmhouse, such that any views between the two are over the site of the proposed extension.

9. The Meadows is a modest L shaped building arranged around a parking courtyard to the front. It is single storey with rooms in the roof, provided with dormers, rooflights and windows in some of the gable ends and set within a large open garden that slopes up away from the house to the rear and east side. The character of the property is of a modest, low level building with simple form and L-shaped layout set around the parking courtyard, within a large open plot.

10. The proposed extension would result in a sprawling T shaped building physically located between the listed building and the open countryside that contributes to its setting. It would result in two courtyard style areas to either side of the house and a very long elevation facing the public open space. The landscape, including topography and mature planting means that views and vistas across and over this site between the surrounding countryside and Little Park Farmhouse would be limited. Nevertheless, the extension would be located within these views and would affect the appreciation of the listed building from the public open space and the countryside setting of the listed building.

11. The proposed east facing dormer to the existing part of the building would be located on the opposite side of the dwelling from the listed building and would be modest in size. As a result, it would not affect the setting of Little Park Farmhouse.

12. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would harm the setting of the Grade II* listed building of Little Park Farmhouse. Given the relationship between the heritage asset, its countryside setting and the proposed development, that harm would be very low on the scale of less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset.

13. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises at Paragraph 212 that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the

heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Accordingly, while less than the 'substantial harm' referred to in Paragraph 214 of the Framework, the harm to the listed building is nevertheless a matter of considerable importance in this case.

14. Paragraph 215 of the Framework establishes that, where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use. My attention has not been drawn to public benefits in this instance, although I note that paragraph 135 of the Framework requires a high standard of amenity for future users of development. Whilst the improvement to living conditions of occupiers of the dwelling is largely a private benefit, ensuring high standards of amenity in accordance with the Framework can carry some public benefit. However, that benefit is minimal and cannot outweigh the identified harm to the listed building.

15. It would, therefore, conflict with Policy DP34 of the DP and the Framework that seek development to protect listed buildings and their settings, with special regard given to protecting the setting of a listed building.

Character and appearance

16. The Meadows is located alongside two other dwellings within the former farmyard. In addition, I understand another barn has permission to redevelop for a further dwelling. These dwellings are accessed via a track that also leads to an area of public open space on the edge of Hurstpierpoint. That open space extends around the front and side of The Meadows, with a footpath leading from that to Trinity Road and into Hurstpierpoint. The open space is separated from the property by mature trees and hedgerow that significantly restrict views of the property. This has resulted in an edge of settlement semi-rural character and appearance to this small group of houses.

17. The proposed extension would reflect the design and appearance of the existing building. The floor levels would be below those of the existing although this is not reflected in the roofline, both eaves and ridge matching the height of the existing. As with the existing dwelling, light would be provided to the rooms in the roof via dormer windows and rooflights. It would effectively result in an additional courtyard to the rear that would result in an unusual layout.

18. The resulting long wall to the east side of the dwelling facing toward the public open space would make the whole appear as a very large and long block of building. This would alter the modest character of the existing dwelling to result in a more complicated layout and a sprawling and substantial house. Although mature planting obscures the building in views from the open space to a large extent, this would result in harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling in this location.

19. The proposed east facing dormer to the existing part of the building would be modest and reflect the design of the existing building. As a result, it would not materially affect the character and appearance of the building or surrounding area.

20. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed two storey extension would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such, it conflicts with Policies DP12 and DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan (DP) and Policy Countryside HurstC1 of the Hurstpierpoint Neighbourhood Plan (NP) that seek development to be of

high quality design and layout that creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of surrounding buildings and landscape. They seek to protect the countryside in recognition of its intrinsic character and beauty, with development required to maintain or enhance the quality of rural and landscape character.

Other Matters

21. My attention has been drawn to previous appeal decisions and decisions of the Council for extensions to this dwelling. These were mostly in different locations around the building such that they had a different effect on the character and appearance of the building and setting of Little Park Farmhouse. The previous extension approved in this location would be substantially smaller than that proposed, such that its effects would also be different. For these reasons, I have considered the proposed development on its individual merits.

Conclusion

22. I have concluded that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the area and cause less than substantial harm to the significance of Little Park Farmhouse as a heritage asset. As a result, it would conflict with Policies DP12, DP26 and DP34 of the DP and Policy Countryside HurstC1 of the NP and that has resulted in conflict with the development plan as a whole. I have not identified any material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. For these reasons, the appeal should be dismissed.

AJ Steen

INSPECTOR