

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 16 June 2026 14:53:16 UTC+01:00
To: "Deborah Lynn" <Deborah.Lynn@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/26/0604 Redgate Mill, Twineham Lane, Twineham

Hi Debbie

Comments on the above planning application.

Firstly, I note that as the proposal potentially affects the setting of II* listed building Historic England should be consulted.

In addition, a Heritage Statement is required, which should consider the impact of the proposal, through setting, on the special interests of all of the adjacent listed buildings. Although a Statement has been provided, this is not adequate in its scope or level of detail. For example, it does not consider all of the works which have taken place or are proposed, and does not mention the change of use of the land. It also fails to consider all of the affected assets. A revised and expanded statement should be provided, prepared according to the staged approach to such assessment which is set out in the relevant Historic England guidance GPA Note 3 *'The Setting of Heritage Assets'*.

Redgate Mill is an unlisted detached house located in a semi-rural position within the small village of Twineham. Planning permission for the construction of the house, which replaced a storage unit, was granted in 2016. A subsequent permission allowed for the construction of a detached garage. The current application which is partly retrospective relates to a field in agricultural use located to the south west of the house and its garden adjacent to Twineham Lane, and is for its change of use to residential, with creation of a football pitch, swimming/wildlife pond with associated equipment, pavilion/pool house, boardwalk and pathways. The proposal includes the removal of a section of hedgerow adjacent to the road to allow for access for construction.

There are a number of listed buildings within the vicinity of the site:

- Slipe, Twineham Lane

Slipe is a Grade II* listed building located adjacent to the northern boundary of the site. From the list description, the house was originally constructed during the early 15th century as a timber framed open hall house. A solar wing was added in the late 15th century. The building was formerly the farmhouse of Slipe Farm; a courtyard of former farm buildings survives as Twineham Barns just to the east. These buildings, which from historical map regression date from the 19th century or earlier, are likely to be regarded as either curtilage listed, or as non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs), depending on factors such as the date that their ownership was severed from that of Slipe house. The relevant Historic England guidance on Listed Buildings and Curtilage would apply, and should ideally be considered as part of the revised and expanded heritage statement. The

farmstead is recorded in the West Sussex Historic Farmstead and Landscape Character assessment as a historic farmstead of the post medieval period.

Based on the limited information in front of us, I would consider it likely that Slipe will possess architectural value based on its construction and craftsmanship, historical illustrative value as a very good example of an early Sussex farmhouse, and aesthetic interest based in part on the use of vernacular materials views within the landscape from which they were drawn. As such, the surviving rural setting of the building will be considered to make a strong positive contribution to the special interest of the listed building and the manner in which this is appreciated. Although the house is within Twineham, the small size of this settlement and the loose grain of development, with retention of pockets of undeveloped agricultural land between buildings, as well as the surviving surrounding countryside, contribute to a semi-rural character which is complementary to the special interest of the II* listed building.

The former farm buildings would also be regarded as heritage assets- possibly curtilage listed buildings, but otherwise NDHAs. The rural setting of these buildings will likewise contribute to their significance as parts of a historic farmstead.

The application site is just to the south of Slipe and its historic farmstead, and seems likely to have originally formed part of its farmlands. As noted above, the house on the site replaced a storage building quite recently, but the field which is the subject of the current application retained its agricultural character until the unauthorised works which it is now proposed to regularise. Although intervisibility between the site and listed building and former farm buildings is likely to have been limited due to intervening planting, the site formed part of the wider setting of the heritage assets, being particularly important to the semi-rural character of Twineham, and to the character of the approach to the Slipe farmstead along Twineham Lane from the south. It therefore in its previous state made a positive contribution to the special interests of Slipe and its former farm buildings- this contribution would be strengthened if it is confirmed that the site was previously part of the Slipe farmlands (this should be addressed by the required heritage statement).

- Park Farm, Twineham Lane.

Park Farmhouse is a Grade II listed timber framed building dating from c.1600, with a 19th century wing. There are also a number of surviving historic farm buildings within the farmstead, which are likely to be regarded as curtilage listed. The farmstead is recorded in the West Sussex Historic Farmstead and Landscape Character Assessment as a historic farmstead of the Medieval period.

Based on the limited information in front of us, Park Farmhouse is likely to be considered to possess architectural value based on its construction and

craftsmanship, historical illustrative value as a good example of a Sussex farmhouse of its period, and aesthetic value based in part on the use of vernacular materials viewed within the landscape from which they were drawn. Any curtilage listed farm buildings will possess similar values as buildings of their type and period.

As such, the surviving rural setting of the farmstead will be considered to make a strong positive contribution to the special interests of the listed and curtilage listed buildings and the manner in which these are appreciated, in particular their historical illustrative and aesthetic values. The site is (or was) part of the wider rural setting of the farmstead, in particular affecting the character of the approach to it along Twineham Lane.

- The Old Rectory, Church Lane, Twineham

The Old Rectory is an early 19th century building located a short distance to the west of the site, adjacent to Church Lane. It is likely to be considered to possess architectural value based on its design, construction and craftsmanship, historical illustrative value as a good example of a rural Sussex rectory, at the centre of village life and closely connected with the functioning of the village church, and aesthetic value. The building also has group value with the church (St Peter's, Grade I listed) which is a short distance to the northwest at the end of the lane.

The village setting and wider rural context of the building will be considered to make a positive contribution to its special interest and the manner in which this is appreciated, in particular those parts of that interest which are drawn from historical illustrative and aesthetic values. The application site is (or was) part of the wider setting of the listed building, contributing to the semi-rural character of Twineham village. It also contributes to the character of the approach to the Rectory along Twineham Lane/Church Lane.

The current proposal, which as noted above is partly retrospective, is for various works relating to the change of use of the land from agricultural to residential. These works include creation of a football pitch on the eastern part of the field, creation of a swimming/wildlife pond with associated pumping and filtration equipment to the western part, a pavilion/pool house adjacent to this, new gravel paths and boardwalks, and removal of a section of hedgerow to the southern edge of the field adjacent to Twineham Lane to allow for access during construction.

In my opinion, the change of use of this field to what is essentially a domestic garden space will have a fundamental impact on its character, and will remove and reverse the positive contribution which it currently makes, through setting, to the listed buildings noted above. There is therefore an in principle objection, on heritage grounds, to the proposal.

In terms of the physical works proposed:

- The football pitch to its eastern side, with associated close mown grass, goals, etc. has a clearly domestic character which detracts from the formerly rural, agricultural nature of the site.
- The 'wildlife pond' would appear in fact to be a swimming pond, based on its size, profile and the presence of fairly substantial pumping and filtration equipment. Further clarification of this should be provided, alongside details of the equipment, which is not shown on the submitted plans, and associated pipework. A swimming pool within the former field would be a further addition of a domestic nature, even if the design is less formal than a conventional pool.
- With respect to the proposed 'rural pavilion', which is shown in a position adjacent to the swimming pool, I have concerns regarding its scale, form and detailed design. I would also suggest that further information should be provided on the intended use of this building, which would appear in fact to be a pool house, including staging overhanging and potentially providing access to the pool. The internal rooms within the building are not annotated, but the layout suggests potential for shower and/or changing rooms consistent with a domestic pool house use. Furthermore, the scale of this building, which has a footprint of 8m x 3m not including the staging, is considerable, and will detract from the open nature of the site. Its monopitch roof form and the inclusion of sliding-folding glazed doors to the eastern side are not typical of rural agricultural buildings in the area, and again suggest a domestic use. This aspect of the proposal would therefore further detract from the previously rural character of the site.
- The introduction of gravel pathways within the site will be further domesticating feature which detracts from its historic rural, agricultural character.
- A quite substantial section of hedgerow has been removed to the southern side of the field to allow for construction access (I am not sure that the full extent of the removal is shown on the submitted plans?). This is highly regrettable, given that this was previously a well-established hedge which may have been of considerable age, and which aside from its wildlife value made a strong positive contribution to the semi-rural character of Twineham and of this part of Twineham Lane. It is difficult to understand why access could not have been achieved via the existing entrance to the property, which is a short distance to the east, without this damage being caused. The current application states that the hedgerow will be reinstated using appropriate native species, but unfortunately as the hedgerow removed was mature it seems unlikely that replacement hedging will have the same value for many years to come. Nonetheless it will be important to ensure that this work does take place, whether by condition on an eventual approval or via appropriate enforcement action. I would however consider that in the short to medium term at least this aspect of the proposal has resulted in harm to the settings of the adjacent heritage assets.

In summary, both the principle of the change of use of the site and the associated physical works to it, some of which are retrospectively applied for, result in my opinion in a degree of less than substantial harm, through impact on setting, to the special interests of the listed buildings identified above. Further information including a fully detailed heritage statement, clarification on the nature of the pool use and associated

equipment, and confirmation of the extent of the hedgerow removal will be necessary for fully informed comment, and to more accurately establish the level of harm arising. In addition, further works appear to have taken place on site which should possibly be included with this application, and are set out below.

Whilst we were on site, we noticed a solar PV array within the western part of the field- this is shown on the submitted plans but does not appear to be part of the current application. It would be helpful to confirm if this array has, or requires, planning permission as I cannot find a relevant record from a brief search of the planning history. This array has an effect on the character of the site which is potentially cumulative with the works discussed above, and should potentially be included in any application to regularise the situation.

We also noted that an artificially surfaced golf area with landscaped putting green, bunkers etc. has been created to the northeast of the house at Redgate Mill, adjacent to the boundary with Slipe. A shepherd's hut has also been positioned in this location. I would defer to the case officer as to whether either of both of these require planning permission, however if this is the case I would also have potential concerns with respect to the golf installation in particular, due to the artificial nature of the surfacing and the recontouring of the land in this position close to the II* listed building and historic farmstead. I noted that there is screening by vegetation along the boundary, but that glimpsed views through this were possible, and I would expect that this would be potentially much more the case in winter. Again, although on a different part of the land associated with Redgate Mill, the impact of this work may be cumulative with those which have taken place/are proposed to the field discussed above. I can provide more detailed comments if this work is included in any revised application.

Thanks,

Emily

Please note that this advice is given at Officer level only and is without prejudice to the formal decision of the District Council.

Submit your planning application online.
<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk>

Emily Wade Ma MSc
Conservation Officer
Planning Services
Tel: +44 (0)1444 477385
emily.wade@midsussex.gov.uk <http://www.midsussex.gov.uk>

The
Electoral
Commission

You now need
photo ID to
vote at a
polling station

No ID? You can apply for free voter ID

Find out more at

electoralcommission.org.uk/voterID

or call 0800 328 0280