

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 23 June 2026 09:27:23 UTC+01:00
To: "Stefan Galyas" <Stefan.Galyas@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/26/1057 and 1058 Tanyard Manor, Horsted Lane

Hi Stefan

Comments on the above planning and listed building consent applications.

Tanyard Manor is a Grade II listed building located in a rural position to the south of Sharpthorne. The earliest phase of the building, which is the east wing, dates from the 15th century. It was extended during the 17th century by the addition of a western wing, which was then extended again to the north during the early 20th century. The building was apparently initially connected with a tannery, before becoming a farmhouse, and latterly a country house.

In my opinion, the house will possess architectural value based on its construction and craftsmanship over several distinct developmental phases, historical illustrative value as a good example of a rural Sussex dwelling which has evolved over many centuries in response to a changing socio-economic context and the needs and aspirations of successive occupants, and aesthetic value based in part on the use of vernacular materials viewed within the landscape from which they were drawn. As such, the surviving rural character of the setting around Tanyard Manor will be considered to make a strong positive contribution to the setting of the listed building and the manner in which this is appreciated.

There are a small number of buildings to the northwest of the house which include surviving farm buildings from the former farmstead of Tanyard Farm, some of which would be regarded as curtilage listed. Although these buildings have been subject to alteration and in some cases partial rebuilding, they also make a positive contribution to the setting of Tanyard Manor, and contribute to its special interest, in particular its historical illustrative value as a former farmhouse. The farmstead is recorded in the West Sussex Historic Farmstead and Landscape Character assessment as a historic farmstead of the Medieval period.

The current proposal relates to an L shaped building with apparent 17th-18th century origins which includes an annexe and stables. The building was altered and extended during the 19th and 20th centuries, to adapt to its changing use, including evolution of the farming function. In the early 20th century, a fire led to the rebuilding of the first floor and roof structure of the annexe.

The current proposal is for internal and external alterations to this building to adapt it for use as a games room, external WC and residential accommodation. To consider the proposed works in turn:

- Internal works at ground floor:

Within the annexe building the existing open fronted garage spaces are retained largely as they are. Some alterations to the flooring are proposed, but to include retention of remaining historic fabric. This is considered acceptable subject to detail.

The conversion of the adjacent kitchen to a sitting room is not considered contentious.

The works to the attached stable wing include removal of a number of stall partitions. Although it is proposed to retain the feeding troughs and stable doors, the loss of the internal subdivision will have some negative impact on the manner in which the intended purpose of this part of the building can be read, regardless of the varying date of the fabric involved. This will result in a degree of harm to the curtilage listed building.

The alteration to an existing door opening to allow for repositioning of the door into the end bay, which is proposed for use as a store appears unjustified, as there is an existing door into this bay which could be used without change to the plan form, or loss or alteration of fabric.

- Internal works to the building at first floor

Changes are proposed to the plan form of the annexe at first floor. This part of the building was rebuilt earlier this century following fire damage. As such, this work is not considered to adversely impact the special interest of the building.

- External works

Externally, a large number of new or repositioned and enlarged rooflights are proposed. In my opinion, the number and size of these are excessive, and will result in some harm to the character of the building. I would also be concerned that the repositioning and enlargement of the rooflights to the stable block, plus one additional window, may result in loss of historic fabric from the roof structure of the building.

The removal of the mid 20th century link between the stable block and adjacent WC block is not considered contentious.

Proposed re-roofing works are not considered contentious, subject to detail.

The proposal to retain and glaze behind the existing stable doors is not considered contentious in principle, but the design of the glazed doors requires simplification to better express the dimensions of the openings and avoid a domesticated appearance.

- Insulation

The proposed method of insulation to the walls is not considered contentious in principle, although a condition would be required with reference to the internal finish- in some instances where timber cladding may be present and contributes positively to the character of the space we may require that this is reinstated instead of plasterboard and skim. Further detail would be required to establish this.

To the roof, however, the proposal to insulate between and below the existing historic rafters to the stable, with the addition of 'aesthetic' rafters beneath this, is not considered appropriate, and would require amendment. In general, in the conversion of agricultural buildings of this nature insulation between and/or

above the rafters will be preferred, so that the historic frame remains open to view.

In summary, although some aspects of the proposal are not considered contentious, other aspects including in particular the works internally to the stable block to remove partitions, the proposed new and altered rooflights, and the method of insulation to the roof of the stable block, are considered to result in a degree of less than substantial harm to the special interest of the curtilage listed building, and via setting to the special interest of Tanyard Manor. I would place this harm at low-mid in relation to the outbuilding itself, and low in relation to the Manor. The balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 of the NPPF would therefore apply.

The proposal will also be contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34 for these reasons.

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>



No ID? You can apply for free voter ID
Find out more at
electoralcommission.org.uk/voterID
or call 0800 328 0280