

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 December 2025 15:39:05 UTC+00:00
To: "Katherine Williams" <Katherine.Williams@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/25/2932 and 2934 Lime Grove Barn

Hi Katherine

Comments on the above planning and listed building consent applications.

Lime Grove Barn is a Grade II listed building dating from the 18th century. The list description describes it as a stables with hayloft above and a one storey wing to the east- we have little further detail within the submitted heritage statement, and no historic building survey. Consent was granted for the conversion of the building in 1995. The building is located in close proximity to Legh Manor, a Grade II listed building dating originally from 1540-1550 and restored by Lutyens in 1917. This building was originally the dower house for the nearby, now lost, manor house, but became successively a farmhouse and later a country residence. The farmstead associated with the farm included Lime Grove Barn, and the buildings have group value.

The current proposal relates to alterations to the main building and to an outbuilding to the northwest. The works to the main building are identical to those approved by DM/22/0530 and 0531- as such, they are not considered contentious, and I will not discuss them further here.

With respect to the works to the outbuilding, I would first note that the submitted heritage statement is inadequate in that it does not discuss the age or level of interest of the outbuilding concerned, or its contribution to the special interest of Lime Grove Barn. I would suggest that this is addressed.

The proposed works themselves to this building comprise installation of rooflights, alterations to window and door openings, and installation of partitions and of insulation.

From the limited information in front of us, and from a brief historic map regression exercise, it would appear that the outbuilding dates from the late 19th or early 20th century. It is of brick construction with a pitched tiled roof. It retains a broadly agricultural character, although it has been altered both externally and internally, including by the changes to window and door openings, introduction of rooflights which were subsequently tiled over, and boarding out of the roof internally.

In terms of the current proposals, some aspects of the works affect fabric already altered – for example, four of the six rooflights shown are to existing openings which have been tiled over externally, and the proposed enlargement of window and door openings to the southern elevation will reinstate these to their previous dimensions, as demonstrated by existing sills and brick infill. These aspects of the proposal are not considered contentious.

In respect of the detail of the new or altered windows and doors, I note that the proposed plans indicate the use of black uPVC windows and doors to match the existing to the main house. If uPVC windows are present to the listed building, these would appear to have been installed without consent, as a 2020 partially retrospective approval refers to painting all of the windows to the property black, from a previous brown wood stain, and describes the existing windows as being of timber. I would suggest that this is clarified, and the plans updated. In any case, the installation of uPVC windows to the annexe will not be considered acceptable, as this is not an appropriate material for use in the context of a listed building. Painted timber to match existing will be a more acceptable alternative- again, the plans should be updated to reflect this. I would also recommend that the design of the door to the western end elevation is amended to remove the glazed light, which gives an inappropriately domestic appearance. The existing door could be retained, or a similar planked timber replacement installed if necessary.

In terms of the internal alterations, the proposed partitioning is not considered contentious given the existing altered character of the internal spaces, and nor is the enlargement of the hatch opening to the existing dividing wall.

The proposed insulation to the underside of the roof, and the lining out of the brick walls to the property are not considered contentious in the context of the existing boarding to the roof, subject to detail. I would however suggest that the existing internal partition which is of painted brick should be retained as uncovered brickwork, to retain some part of this aspect of the building's more historic internal character. It would be helpful if the plans should be annotated to confirm this. The existing floor surfacing appears to have been altered at least in part, so that the introduction of a floating floor here is not considered contentious.

In summary, although the principle of the proposal is not considered contentious, further information and some revisions will be necessary to ensure that the work preserves the special interest of the curtilage listed building and the setting of Lime Grove Barn.

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