

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 January 2025 10:51:54 UTC+00:00
To: "Hamish Evans" <Hamish.Evans@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/24/2815 The Old Rectory, Church Lane, Twineham

Hi Hamish

Comments on the above planning application.

The application site, the Old Rectory, is a Grade II listed early 19th century house located in a semi-rural position within the village of Twineham. The building is in a neo-Classical style typical of the period, having a formal, symmetrically composed façade with a low pitched hipped roof with wide eaves, central triangular pediment, and rusticated ground floor with projecting central entrance porch with flanking pilasters. Although extended to either side, this original and characteristic symmetry is still readily appreciated, and is enhanced by elements of the extensive landscaped gardens between the house and the Lane, in particular the double entrances from the road and the original curving carriage driveway which sweeps between lawns across the front of the house.

Planning permission and listed building consent were granted in 2023 for demolition of the existing garage and construction of a new garage with proposed gym and office in the roof space, with associated hard and soft landscaping, together with alterations to the driveway to provide access to the new garage. The current proposal is in effect for amendments to this approved scheme to redesign and extend the hard surfacing/parking area which as approved was to the front and side of the garage, as well the creation of a patio area to the eastern side of the house.

To consider the patio first, this would be an extension of an approved terraced area to the south east corner of the building, would be set against an existing extension to the building, and is not in my opinion contentious subject to detail.

I do however have concerns regarding the proposal amendments to the garage access/parking provision. As approved, this is shown in a compact arrangement to the front and eastern side of the garage, having a relatively minor impact on the verdant character of the gardens of the listed building, and not extending significantly forward of the house's façade. The bulk of the hardsurfacing is also set away from the existing driveway. This was considered to preserve key elements of the house's garden setting, including their open and green nature, and the appreciation of the arrangement of the original carriage driveway and flanking lawns. In contrast, the current proposal would introduce an extended area of hard surfacing significantly forward of the house and garage. In my opinion, this would have an unacceptable impact on both the verdant character of the front gardens to the Old Rectory, and on the current appreciation of the original layout of the garden area to the front of the house, detracting from the formal arrangement of double entrances and the sweeping curved driveway reflecting and enhancing the formal, symmetrical composition of the building's façade. I would therefore recommend that this element of the proposal is omitted from the scheme.

As it stand I consider that the proposal is contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. In terms of the NPPF, it would result in less than substantial harm, through impact on

setting, to the special interest of the listed building. I would place this harm at around the low-mid point of that scale. Paragraph 215 will therefore apply.

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