



Planning, Design and Access Statement
Including the Heritage and Sustainability Statements

Crosskeys, 76 High Street, Lindfield

Construction of a single-storey extension to the rear elevation, attached to the existing property by means of a glazed link. Fenestration alterations to include the addition of a porch canopy to the rear elevation, replacement of all existing windows with double glazed units, insertion of roof lantern at first floor level, and roof windows at second floor level. Renewal of existing pitched and flat roof coverings. Internal alterations throughout the ground, first, and second floors. Extension of existing detached Garage to provide a Gym/Games Room. Construction of a detached Workshop and Storage outbuilding to the rear of the garden. Associated hard and soft landscaping works to comprise new terracing and planting

at

Crosskeys, 76 High Street, Lindfield

Planning, Design and Access Statement

on Behalf of

Mr & Mrs N. Nunn

May 2026

Gould Baxter
2-3 Lucastes Mews, Paddockhall Road,
Haywards Heath, West Sussex,
RH16 1HE

Tel: 01444 452604

Email: hh@gouldbaxter.co.uk

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Use	2
3.	Amount	3
4.	Layout	3
5.	Planning Statement / Scale	4
6.	Landscaping	9
7.	Heritage Statement	10
8.	Appearance	10
9.	Access	12
10.	Sustainability Statement	12
11.	Conclusion.....	13
12.	Appendix I – Pre-Application Advice	14

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This is a Planning, Design and Access Statement prepared to accompany a Householder Planning and Listed Building Consent application submission to Mid Sussex District Council for the following:

Construction of a single-storey extension to the rear elevation, attached to the existing property by means of a glazed link. Fenestration alterations to include the addition of a porch canopy to the rear elevation, replacement of all existing windows with double glazed units, insertion of roof lantern at first floor level, and roof windows at second floor level. Renewal of existing pitched and flat roof coverings. Internal alterations throughout the ground, first, and second floors. Extension of existing detached Garage to provide a Gym/Games Room. Construction of a detached Workshop and Storage outbuilding to the rear of the garden. Associated hard and soft landscaping works to comprise new terracing and planting.

- 1.2 Crosskeys is a Grade II listed dwelling and is located in a prominent position centrally in Lindfield High Street, within the Lindfield Conservation Area that falls under an Article 4(2) Direction. The Conservation Area was designated as such in 1969, and buildings within the village are predominantly residential and comprise a range of ages and architectural styles.
- 1.3 The property is located within the built-up area boundary of Lindfield, and sits within a West Sussex County Council Archaeological Notification Area (Red designation), which forms the historic core of Lindfield.
- 1.4 The dwelling itself occupies a generous plot with dwellings surrounding it to the north and south. The existing boundary treatments – predominantly close boarded timber fencing supplemented with hedge planting, and some brick walls, provide the Application property and its garden with a great deal of mutual privacy.
- 1.5 A Heritage Statement and Impact Assessment (HSIA) has been prepared by Maggie Henderson at HB Archaeology and Conservation. This document accompanies this Householder Planning and Listed Building Consent submission as a separate report, concluding that the proposals submitted herein are sympathetic to the existing Grade II listed building and its fabric.
- 1.6 As noted in paragraph 1.3, above, the HSIA also includes a Historic Environment Record search. The outcome of this is discussed within the aforementioned HSIA.
- 1.7 This application is also accompanied by a Tree Survey and Arboricultural Implications Assessment, prepared by GHA Trees. The proposed extension and landscaping works will be in close proximity to the existing trees and the Tree Survey report supports that the proposals submitted herein will not be of detriment to the retained trees. It is proposed to remove three trees, which is discussed below in Section 6 - Landscaping. The removal of these small trees will be dealt with by way of a separate application to MSDC.

- 1.8 An application for pre-application advice was submitted to MSDC in respect of these proposals, with a broadly positive response received. The advice received is appended to this statement and discussed in greater detail in Section 5. However, the advice has been taken onboard and has resulted in the proposals submitted herein.
- 1.9 The proposals placed before the Planning Department are well-considered and of a high standard of sensitive design, demonstrating the following:
- a) The proposed single-storey rear extension to the dwelling is considered acceptable in principle, and is of a modest scale as per the pre-application request;
 - b) The contemporary aesthetic of the proposed extension to the dwelling allows it to sit comfortably alongside the existing dwelling, and coupled with the glass link, provides a visually-contrasting element to ensure it is clearly legible as a later addition to the property;
 - c) The proposed rear extension to the Garage is sensitive in its scale, adopting a modest, twin pitched roof design;
 - d) The proposed outbuilding is also sensitive in its scale, adopting a pitched roof design to mimic that of the garage building to the neighbouring property;
 - e) The proposed extension and fenestration alterations will not affect the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers owing to their subservient nature and the presence of existing boundary screening;
 - f) The proposed fenestration changes will be in keeping with the dwelling, using matching materials and methods;
 - g) The proposed replacement pitched roof covering is a necessity for the protection and longevity of the structure, as a condition survey noted widespread nail fatigue across the roof slopes. The proposal to do so, using a large proportion of salvaged roof tiles, is acceptable in principle. Any new tiles and associated fittings will be sourced to closely match the existing;
 - h) The proposed internal alterations, the principle of which was considered acceptable at the pre-application stage, demonstrate an understanding of the evolution of the dwelling, with careful detailing to ensure the history of the dwelling remains legible;
 - i) The proposed hard and soft landscaping works, sensitive planting, and new paved terracing, will greatly enhance the setting of the listed dwelling, protecting its character and integrity;
 - j) The proposed replacement timber driveway gates will remain in keeping with the vernacular of the existing dwelling and sympathetic to its Listed Building and wider Conservation Area setting.

2. Use

- 2.1 The existing property has full C3 (residential) use and will retain this following the completion of the proposed works.

3. Amount

3.1 The proposals comprise the following works:

- The construction of a contemporary single-storey extension to the rear elevation, attached to the existing dwelling by way of a structural glass link. This method avoids disturbance of the existing wall and retains legibility;
- The creation of a Porch, and replacement of an existing external door, to the rear elevation of the dwelling;
- The replacement of the existing pitched roof coverings, utilising as many salvaged tiles as possible;
- The replacement of the existing windows with new Crittall-style double glazed windows to match;
- The insertion of a plateau rooflight to the existing lead valley to the rear elevation;
- The insertion of new conservation roof windows to the existing pitched roofs, including the replacement of an existing Velux with a conservation-style unit to match the existing opening size;
- Internal alterations throughout the dwelling on all three levels, as detailed on the drawings, and scheduled within the Heritage Statement;
- The construction of a single-storey extension to the rear of the Garage, and partial conversion of the existing space, to provide a Gym and Games Room;
- The construction of a detached outbuilding to the rear of the garden, to provide a Workshop and Storage building;
- Externally, hard and soft landscaping works to the rear, including new paved terracing, remodelled lawn area, and planting beds;
- It is proposed to fell three existing trees – a Malus, a Box elder, and a Thuja plicata; the remaining trees will be retained. The removal of these trees is being dealt with in a separate application to MSDC;
- The provision of replacement timber driveway gates, set between timber posts, sitting in a slightly adjusted position adjacent to the rear, south-east corner of the dwelling.

4. Layout

4.1 The layout of the existing dwelling can be viewed on the accompanying existing plan and elevation drawings. The proposed extension and internal alterations will enhance the layout to provide greater connectivity between the house and its generous gardens. The provision of large-format glazing will bring light deeper into the building.

4.2 To the ground floor, the arrangement of the accommodation will remain largely the same, with the only significant change being the proposed extension providing a living/dining space open to the Kitchen. As discussed below, this extension is attached solely to the most recent extension of the property. A Study will occupy the remaining portion of the rear extension.

- 4.3 To the first floor, the layout changes occur to the north-east of the house, primarily within the 1939 portion. It is here that the existing WC/Cloaks, existing Bathroom, and existing large Laundry cupboard, will all be removed. In place of the Laundry cupboard will be a larger room that provides an En-suite facility, with the existing Bathroom and WC/Cloaks making way for an enlarged rear Bedroom. The former WC/Cloaks space will feature a freestanding bath, to complement the proposed En-suite. This Bedroom will be enhanced through the provision of a vaulted ceiling and rooflights to its north and south facing roof slopes. To the wide lead valley over the freestanding bath, a plateau rooflight will be inserted to provide this with excellent natural light.
- 4.4 To the second floor, the layout will remain unchanged. The proposal will involve the removal of the existing, modern, beam above the floor, which will make the larger of the two rooms far more useable, and both rooms more accessible.
- 4.5 The proposed extension to the rear of the existing Garage, will comprise a Games Room, Gym space, and a Shower Room. A portion of the existing tandem-length Garage will be converted to create this accommodation.
- 4.6 The proposed detached outbuilding will provide a Workshop and Storage space, and will include a small WC.

5. Planning Statement / Scale

Planning Policies

- 5.1 There are a number of planning policies relevant to this application. As set out in the pre-application advice received, these include:

Mid Sussex District Plan
DP26 – Character and Design
DP34 – Listed Buildings
DP35 – Conservation Areas
DP37 – Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
DP39 – Sustainable Design and Construction

Planning History

- 5.2 The most recent, relevant applications for the property, as follows:

LF/097/87/API – ERECTION OF GARAGE AND ASSOCIATED WORKS TO DRIVE AND GATES. AMENDED PLANS SHOWING: reduction in length of proposed building, deletion of one door and window from garden elevation and change of location of retained door and window – **APPROVED**

12/02441/TCA – Removal of 2 juniper trees and replace with 2 Juniper Communis. Lower height of bay tree in rear garden – **NO OBJECTION**

Planning Pre-Application Advice

- 5.3 A pre-application enquiry was submitted in August 2025, with a site visit taking place in September 2025. The formal written advice was received in January 2026, comprising a formal response from both the Conservation Officer and the Planning Officer. The full text of the advice is provided in Appendix I and is broadly supportive of the proposals, subject to some amendments being made.
- 5.4 The Conservation Officer notes that the extension is proposed to attach to an early 20th century (1939) addition to the, and as such there will be no direct impact on the earlier fabric of the house. Furthermore, the extension is shown as a single storey with a relatively low profile, which will have relatively little, if any, impact on views of the rear elevation. She concludes that *'In the existing context.....the scope for further extension to the building is limited, however it may be that a significantly more modest addition, omitting the study and drawing back the proposed rear building line of the dining room may be more favourably viewed.'* The scheme submitted herein takes this advice on board in terms of reducing the overall width and depth of the proposed extension to the dwelling. In addition to this, this extension is far shallower than those to the adjoining neighbouring properties.
- 5.5 The Conservation Officer confirmed her acceptance in principle to the extension of the Garage building to provide a Gym and Games Room, and to the principle of the proposed detached Workshop and Storage building.
- 5.6 In respect of the various internal alterations, the Conservation Officer was largely favourable to these, with the most contentious aspects (second floor dormers, and second floor En-suite) having been omitted from the scheme.
- 5.7 The Conservation Officer explained that she does not have an objection in principle to appropriate landscaping works adjacent to the proposed extension and alterations. Some concerns were raised in respect of its extent, and therefore requested the extent of hard landscaping be reduced in size. A greater proportion of the green space is retained, which helps to soften the appearance of the modest, subservient dwelling and garage extensions.
- 5.8 The property sits within a WSCC Archaeological Notification Area, which will require the application submission to include a completed Historic Environment Record search.
- 5.9 The Conservation Officer summarises that, whilst the majority of the proposals are not considered contentious in principle, the scale and aspects of the detailed design of the proposed extensions and associated hard landscaping require some reconsideration, to ensure that the special interest of the building and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area are proposed. Any formal application would be considered against the requirements of District Plan Policies DP34 and DP35, as well as the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF, and the Council's adopted Design Guide.

Heritage Statement and Impact Assessment (HSIA)

- 5.10 This statement must be read in conjunction with the HSIA report prepared by Maggie Henderson, that considers the origins and evolution of the dwelling over time.
- 5.11 The HSIA finds that the first Phase in the development of the building occurred in the early to mid 15th Century, and comprised a two-bay open hall at its centre. This hall was open to the roof, and was flanked by a pair of two-storey end bays, conforming to the typical three-cell layout of the traditional medieval hall house. The second Phase, likely dating from the late 16th Century, saw the insertion of the multi-flue chimney stack into the former cross passage at the north end of the hall. The open hall also received a first floor to create an additional chamber. The third Phase of development occurred only a short while later, estimated to be circa. 1635 +/- 15 years, which involved north-east end of the house being rebuilt, reducing the depth of Bay (from Phase1). The first floor rooms in this Phase 3 addition, likely to have comprised two chambers, would have been open to the roof.
- 5.12 The fourth Phase of the development had occurred by 1845, by which time the property had been subdivided into two dwellings. The addition of a lean-to outshot to the east elevation had occurred, providing facilities for each dwelling. The fifth Phase of development during the 19th Century saw further subdivision, without extensions, into three separate units of accommodation. By 1898 the two cottage layout had been reinstated and a separate shop added to the west side of the southern cottage. The sixth Phase of development occurred in 1939, which saw the removal of the shop unit, the reversion to a single dwelling, the addition of the front Porch, the construction of a two-storey extension, and general modernisation throughout, including replacement windows and new ground floors.
- 5.13 The seventh and final recorded Phase has occurred since 1939, though this may have occurred shortly after the 1939 changes as a consequence of the owner's requirements changing.
- 5.14 The HSIA report explains that the significance of the listed building is derived primarily from its early origin, layout and evolution over the course of six centuries, including the legible 15th century plan form and fabric, evidence of early modernisation, survival of the early 17th century two bay cross-wing, and later alterations reflecting changes in local social and economic conditions. The Conservation Officer notes in her pre-application response that she sees no reason to disagree with this assessment.
- 5.15 The HSIA provides a positive assessment of the impact of the proposals on both the setting of the Listed Building of Crosskeys and the wider Conservation Area.

Visual Impact and Impact on Heritage Assets

- 5.16 The HSIA confirms that the modern design approach of the proposed extension to the dwelling will ensure the additions are legible as part of a new layer of activity, rather than seeking to replicate the materials of the 1939 addition.
- 5.17 The HSIA, in its original form, expressed that the extent of hard landscaping should be reduced. As discussed elsewhere, this has been actioned within the

submitted proposals, such that the landscaping is modest, and sensitive to its setting.

Scale

- 5.18 The proposed rear extension to the house is modest in scale, having been designed with a lead flat roof to remain subservient to the existing dwelling. The proposed extension has been designed as a readily identifiable contemporary addition – attached via a glazed link – to ensure the historic evolution of the building continues to be understood.
- 5.19 The proposed extension to the rear of the Garage is also subservient in its form, with twin pitches to be further subservient to the already low pitched roof form. The scale of the outbuilding to the rear of the garden is discussed in para. 5.33.

Design

- 5.20 While, the existing living accommodation is very much useable and contributes immensely to providing a family home, the existing layout is poor and offers little in the way of connection to the generously-proportioned rear garden. The proposed single-storey extension, with its glass and brick elevations, and full-width glass link, presents a sensitively-considered design solution, allowing it to sit comfortably alongside the house which over the centuries has been extended and remodelled. These proposals are an appropriate and modern contribution to this progress.
- 5.21 The pre-application advice requested that the proposed single-storey rear extension be reduced in scale from that submitted for discussion. The scale of the proposed extension has therefore been reduced in both its depth and its width, and now incorporates a full-width structural glass link – continuous horizontally and vertically – to physically separate the proposed rear extension from the existing fabric. The Conservation Officer's advice acknowledges that the proposed extension will attach to the 1939 portion of the property, and the proposals submitted herein can demonstrate that their form and scale are such that the existing form retains its legibility. The proposed extension will not, therefore, have an inappropriate relationship with the dwelling's historic core. In providing a glazed link between the extension and the existing dwelling to avoid blurring their distinctiveness.
- 5.22 By virtue of their sensitive design and detailing, the proposal to extend the dwelling demonstrates a well-considered and **high standard of design**. The contemporary typology will result in a remodelled and extended listed building of exceptional character and architectural merit. The adoption of a full-width glass link demonstrates sensitivity, ensuring the rear elevation remains visible from the rear garden. Furthermore, none of the extension will be visible from the public realm.
- 5.23 In respect of the replacement windows to the dwelling, the HSIA explains in para. 9.4.17 that the existing windows do not contribute strongly in their own right to the character or significance of the building. They appear to date from the 1939 programme of works, and it is suggested (and agreed) that the existing openings remain of the same proportions

- 5.24 In respect of the Garage, the Heritage Statement notes that it is modern in origin, having been approved for construction in 1987, with its fabric being generic and resulting in a rather functional building with domestic detail on its northern side facing the garden. It is acknowledged that while it is not of any character, its low single-storey form ensures it does not detract from, or compete with, the host building.
- 5.25 As described in para. 5.27, the proposed extension to the Garage is designed with a roof form that is further subservient so as to continue this sensitive approach.
- 5.26 The proposed outbuilding to the rear of the garden is of a scale in keeping with its surroundings. It adopts a traditional appearance with painted featheredge timber boarding, fixed horizontally, beneath a pitched roof in plain clay tiles. Its form takes into consideration the neighbour's detached garaging that sits adjacent to the boundary to the south. The existing planting to the north ensures the building is well-screened from the neighbouring gardens, while the fencing and planting along the rear boundary helps to screen views of the proposed building from the public footpath. From the south, the neighbour's detached garage building will largely conceal views of the proposed building.
- 5.27 The design aspects are covered in greater detail in Section 8 – Appearance, which concludes that the proposals demonstrate compliance with MSDC local planning policies DP26, DP34 and DP35.

Internal Alterations

- 5.28 There are a number of internal alterations to the dwelling, which are summarised as follows:
- At ground floor, a portion of the dining room floor level to be reduced to match the kitchen, with associated adjustments to the step and door;
 - At the rear of the ground floor, retention of one oak post to the kitchen, and removal of another;
 - Removal of modern infill to a former door opening between the Kitchen and Dining Room, and insertion of a glazed panel between the existing timber studs;
 - Adjacent to this to the Kitchen side, modern finishes to the wall removed and lathe and plaster reinstated;
 - At first floor, to the north-west Bedroom, insert a doorway to the southeast corner of the room;
 - Removal of a modern partition and doorway to closet to the northwest side of the stair landing;
 - Alterations to plan from to create new en-suite to the northeast of the building;
 - Removal of bathroom and WC in 1939 first floor extension;
 - Increase in height to two doors to first floor level;
 - To the northern side of the chimney stack at second floor level adjacent to the stair, removal of modern plasterboard and fibreboard finishes, and their replacement with glazed partitions to increase visibility of chimney and crown post;

- In association with the above, the ceiling above the stairwell/second floor landing is to be removed to allow views into the roof space, with plaster finishes applied to underside of existing rafters;
 - Also at second floor, removal of a modern floor level beam within the room to the south of the chimney stack;
 - Removal of ceiling finishes to attic rooms to expose joists and open up views to apex of roof;
 - Lightening of beams on the ground floor, within the Dining Room, Kitchen, and rear Corridor.
- 5.29 The HSIA provides justification for these changes, and in each instance these changes have been accepted in principle by the Conservation Officer at the pre-application stage.
- 5.30 These alterations will not be visible externally, with the internal adjustments being suitably detailed so the history of the Grade II listed dwelling can be understood.

6. Landscaping

- 6.1 To the front of the property, the garden boundaries are clearly defined by the brick wall to the north, and painted picket fencing to the front and south. To the rear, taller brick walls screen the property adjacent to its rear elevation, with the remaining boundaries having 1.8m high close-boarded timber fencing, reinforced with established shrub and hedge planting. The existing boundary treatments to the rear ensure mutual privacy between Crosskeys and its adjoining neighbours. These boundary treatments are to remain wholly unchanged.
- 6.2 In her pre-application response, the Conservation Officer explained that the reconfiguration of the existing landscaping is acceptable in principle, but requested that the extent of the hard landscaping be reduced. The proposals submitted herein therefore demonstrate a significant reduction in the extent of hard landscaping, introducing new planted beds within current hard landscaping to further soften its appearance. The result is a sensitive landscaping scheme, with modest hard surfacing, that successfully links the extended dwelling to its generously-proportioned rear garden. The existing and proposed soft landscaping helps to further soften the appearance of the modest, subservient extension. As explained above, the proposed extension is far shallower than those to the adjoining neighbouring properties.
- 6.3 A new paved terrace will be formed immediately adjacent to the proposed single-storey house extension, with level access to the existing lawn area. The existing parking area to the front of the Garage is finished with red brick pavers, and it is proposed to retain this finish. The use of natural stone and red brick paving is very much in keeping with the host dwelling and the surrounding buildings, with the two materials complementing each other.
- 6.4 The existing hedge and tree planting will largely be retained, with the retained hedges and trees to be protected throughout the course of the construction

works. The accompanying tree survey report by GHA Trees explains how the proposed works will not affect the health and longevity of the retained trees.

6.5 The only trees to be removed are:

- T5 – Malus – C1
- T6 – Box elder - U
- G11 – Thuja plicata – C2

6.6 The removal of the above trees will be covered by a separate application for works to trees in a conservation area. In the case of tree T5, Malus, this is to be carefully removed and replanted in a sunny location towards the rear of the garden, as indicated on the site plan drawing.

6.7 The Garage extension will receive a small paved patio in stone to match that of the house extension, with the outbuilding having a modest border of gravel to its perimeter. The existing brick pavers will be retained, with cleaning to restore their appearance.

6.8 Overall, the landscaping works are sensitively considered and ensure the proposals integrate seamlessly with their listed building and conservation area setting.

7. Heritage Statement

7.1 This application is accompanied by a Heritage Statement and Impact Assessment prepared by Maggie Henderson of HB Archaeology and Conservation. This includes the Historic Environment Record data and a discussion of the findings.

8. Appearance

8.1 By virtue of their sensitive design and detailing, the proposals demonstrate a well-considered and **high standard of design**. The contemporary typology will result in an extended listed building of exceptional character and architectural merit.

Proposed Rear Extension - Dwelling

8.2 The juxtaposition between the architectural typology of the listed building and the proposed extension ensures there is clear delineation between the old and the new, while its material palette instils a strong sense of place through reference to its surroundings.

8.3 The proposed rear extension will be elevated facing brick, punctuated by full-height glazed openings, with a simple lead flat roof floating atop the brickwork. The floating roof is accentuated by the glazed corner that enhances the visual separation between the existing dwelling and the proposed extension. The proposed sliding doors and aforementioned corner glazing are subtle and

discrete in their form, being formed in narrow-profile thermally broken metal frames with an anodised finish.

- 8.4 The proposed rear extension will be attached to the existing dwelling by means of a compact and discrete glazed link affording visual separation from the listed building with a 'light touch' approach. This link allows the existing white-painted featheredge timber boarding to remain intact, further minimising its impact on the appearance of the listed building. The link separates the very late historic additions from the new work, allowing the narrative of the building's later evolution to become visually accessible as the property evolves to meet new needs in a future-proof and heritage-led manner.

Garage Extension

- 8.5 The proposed extension to the Garage has been designed to maintain this subservience, with twin pitches to achieve a lower overall height than the existing roof. The gabled ends mimic the gables present on the front elevation of the Garage, and also the rear elevation of the house, with the roofs receiving plain clay tiles to match the existing. The new walls will be faced in stock brickwork, to match the existing in colour and bond, while the horizontal timber boarding to the part-gable facing the house will be finished in white-painted featheredge boards to match the existing. The exposed rafter feet and barge boards will be painted in white to match the existing.
- 8.6 To the Garage, the new windows will be of Crittall-style metal frames in black, with double-glazed units. The existing window openings will be widened to receive windows of the same type. The double doors to the rear elevation will match the windows in their style, with large format glazing to the rear-facing gables.

Outbuilding

- 8.7 The proposed outbuilding will be traditional in its appearance, having plinth walls in facing brick, beneath its white-painted featheredge timber boards. The doors and windows will be in white painted timber to match, with a pitched roof finished in plain clay tiles with matching ridge tile fittings.
- 8.8 It is important to emphasise that the works will be undertaken by skilled, local craftspeople, from those undertaking the works to the masonry brickwork, those replacing the existing pitched roof, through to the leadworkers laying the new flat roof, valleys, and flashings. The Applicants fully appreciate the quality of the existing property and therefore understand how important it will be to carry out the works to the highest possible standard using the best quality materials. Since the Applicants moved into the property in 2024, they have spent time working with ourselves and the heritage consultant to develop and refine the proposals. The initial pre-application submission, and this Planning and Listed Building Consent submission, are testament to this detailed approach.

9. Access

- 9.1 The property will continue to be accessed via its entrance door to the west-facing front elevation.
- 9.2 The lowering of the existing floor in part of the Dining Room will enhance circulation between the front entrance door and the Kitchen to the rear.
- 9.3 The proposed rear extension has been designed with level threshold doors to provide easy access between the property and its generous rear garden. The floor levels within the extension match those within the existing Kitchen, with appropriate headroom clearance beneath the proposed glazed link.
- 9.4 The existing driveway gates will be replaced, with a minor adjustment to their positioning. These will continue to provide privacy and security for the existing property. The existing timber pedestrian gate to the north elevation will remain in situ, with no changes proposed.

10. Sustainability

- 10.1 The proposals have been developed to ensure the extended dwelling achieves the highest level of sustainability that is feasible, with low energy use in its operation. It is envisaged the following will be incorporated:
 - a) The thermal performance of the new building fabric will exceed the standards required by Building Regulations Part L. This will be achieved through the adoption of careful insulation detailing, which in turn will lead to reductions in air permeability and thermal bridging.
 - b) The thermal performance of the existing building fabric will be improved through the installation of new thermal insulation to the pitched and flat roofs. The replacement of the existing windows with new Crittall-style units will reduce draughts and significantly improve energy-efficiency.
 - c) High performance double-glazed windows and sliding doors to the proposed rear extension and remodelled Orangery, with gas-filled cavities and thermally-broken metal frames.
 - d) Water usage will be reduced through the installation of flow reducing / aerating taps, and low-flush cisterns. Water butts will be installed on the Garage and Workshop/Storage buildings to collect rainwater for use in garden irrigation.
 - e) The existing space and hot water heating system will be extended to suit the new works, and will operate with greater efficiency owing to the higher levels of thermal insulation and airtightness present in the proposed extension. This 'fabric first' approach significantly reduces the pressures placed upon the primary heating system.

- f) The south-facing roof slope of the extended Garage building will accommodate 10No. solar photovoltaic panels, which will provide the property with renewable electricity to supplement its electricity requirements.

11. Conclusion

11.1 The proposals placed before the Planning Department are well-considered and of a high standard of sensitive design, demonstrating the following:

- a) The proposed single-storey rear extension to the dwelling is considered acceptable in principle, and is of a modest scale as per the pre-application request;
- b) The contemporary aesthetic of the proposed extension to the dwelling allows it to sit comfortably alongside the existing dwelling, and coupled with the glass link, provides a visually-contrasting element to ensure it is clearly legible as a later addition to the property;
- c) The proposed rear extension to the Garage is sensitive in its scale, adopting a modest, twin pitched roof design;
- d) The proposed outbuilding is also sensitive in its scale, adopting a pitched roof design to mimic that of the garage building to the neighbouring property;
- e) The proposed extension and fenestration alterations will not affect the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers owing to their subservient nature and the presence of existing boundary screening;
- f) The proposed fenestration changes will be in keeping with the dwelling, using matching materials and methods;
- g) The proposed replacement pitched roof covering is acceptable in principle, using as many salvaged tiles as possible. Any new tiles and associated fittings will be sourced to closely match the existing;
- h) The proposed internal alterations, the principle of which was considered acceptable at the pre-application stage, demonstrate an understanding of the evolution of the dwelling, with careful detailing to ensure the history of the dwelling remains legible;
- i) The proposed hard and soft landscaping works, sensitive planting, and new paved terracing, will greatly enhance the setting of the listed dwelling, protecting its character and integrity;
- j) The proposed replacement timber driveway gates will remain in keeping with the vernacular of the existing dwelling and sympathetic to its Listed Building and wider Conservation Area setting.

12. Appendix I – Pre-Application Advice

- 12.1 The following is a transcript of the pre-application advice received from MSDC on 2nd January 2026:

To Mr Harrington,

DM/25/2101 – Crosskeys, 76 High Street, Lindfield - Single storey rear extension; Plateau rooflight over; Construction of dormers to the rear roof slope to match the existing; Insertion of rooflights to the existing pitched roof slopes; Replacement of the existing windows; Various internal alterations across all three floors, An extension to the rear of the existing detached garage building. Solar PV panels on the south-facing roof slope; Detached outbuilding rear of the garden; External works to comprise hard and soft landscaping works.

Many thanks for your enquiry from 19th August and our site meeting of 18th September and my sincere apologies for our delayed response.

Given the nature of the site and the works the proposal would be judged against the following policies DP26 (Character and Design), DP34 (listed Building and Other Heritage Assets) and DP35 (Conservation Areas). Other considerations are the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

The planning history of the site show that the most recent planning history relates to the detached garage (LF/098/87).

Design and Character

DP26 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide state:

'All development and surrounding spaces, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings and replacement dwellings, will be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages while being sensitive to the countryside. All applicants will be required to demonstrate that development:

- is of high quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;
- contributes positively to, and clearly defines, public and private realms and should normally be designed with active building frontages facing streets and public open spaces to animate and provide natural surveillance;
- creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;
- protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;
- protects valued townscapes and the separate identity and character of towns and villages;
- does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, and noise, air and light pollution (see Policy DP29);
- creates a pedestrian-friendly layout that is safe, well connected, legible and accessible;
- incorporates well integrated parking that does not dominate the street environment, particularly where high density housing is proposed;
- positively addresses sustainability considerations in the layout and the building design;
- take the opportunity to encourage community interaction by creating layouts with a strong neighbourhood focus/centre; larger (300+ unit) schemes will also normally be expected to incorporate a mixed use element;
- optimises the potential of the site to accommodate development'.

In terms of the partial conversion of the garage, to serve a shower, gym and games room whilst no elevations have been provided, it is presumed that it will be not be out of character with an outbuilding and as within the built up area this is to be expected.

The rear outbuilding, to the rear of the site, would not be visible from the streetscene, as noted above no elevations have been provided but it is presumed it would visually be similar to surrounding outbuildings to be expected within the built up area.

Principle DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD relates to general design guidance for extensions, whereas DG50 relates to side extensions and DG51 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide relates to the rear extensions.

DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide states:

'Extensions should respond to the design of the original dwelling and applicants will be expected to demonstrate how local character has informed the design proposal. Extensions should also normally be designed to be well-integrated with the existing scale, form and massing allowing the original building to remain the dominant element of the property whether it has one or several additions.

Extensions should typically use simple, uncomplicated building forms to complement and coordinate with the scale, form and massing of the original dwelling. The design approach may benefit from coordinating with the existing pattern of window and door openings as well as employing facing materials to match those of the existing dwelling. Otherwise, it should demonstrate the appropriateness of the alternative approach.

Extensions should not result in a significant loss to the private amenity area of the dwelling.

There are two general approaches to extending a property:

- Designing in the style of the existing building by closely matching its facing materials, architectural features, window sizes and proportions; and
- Designing in a contemporary style that takes its cues from key aspects of the existing building that might include its underlying form and proportions, facing materials, window design and other specific architectural features. The success of this approach is particularly reliant on high quality facing materials and finishes, and this will normally need to be demonstrated through detailed elevations and section drawings.

Both approaches can create successful, well-designed extensions that can be mutually beneficial to both the house and the wider area.

All extensions and alterations should consider their impact on neighbouring properties (refer to Chapter 8 on residential amenity)'.

Principle DG51 states:

'Rear extensions which are not visible from the street and do not negatively impact on neighbouring properties can be expressed in many forms, including by adopting a contemporary architectural approach. With reference to DG49, they should nevertheless have consideration for the character of the existing building and the relationship of the extension with the side boundaries and adjacent buildings and gardens'.

The proposed rear extension is a fair enlargement, and whilst it may be acceptable in terms of DG51, but as noted below the conservation officer has concerns above the scale of the proposal.

The replacement windows are presumed to be visually similar to the existing windows, so would be unlikely to be out of character but concern has been raised by the conservation officer given the lead casement nature of the windows in question.

Principle DG52 of Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD relate to loft conversions and roof extensions and states the following:

'A loft conversion is a space efficient means of extending the amount of living accommodation in a dwelling. Roof accommodation is normally reliant on dormer windows and rooflights to provide light and ventilation. However, if they are out of scale or out of character with the

roofscape and proportions of a dwelling they can have an adverse impact on the character of both the dwelling and the streetscape.

The roof pitch and form are intrinsic to a building's character and roof extensions should be sensitive to this. Roof extensions and dormer windows that alter the existing ridge of the roof or significantly alter the roof profile of a building will not normally be acceptable, particularly on the front roof slope, and where there is a strong established roofline.

Where a clear rhythm of fenestration is established, the position and proportion of dormer windows should respond to existing windows and / or doors.

Further guidance on dormer windows and rooflights is provided in chapter 6 under sections 6.3.5 to 6.3.8.

Dormer Windows and Rooflights

6.3.5 While dormer windows can sometimes be prominent features in the streetscene, care needs to be taken with their design, proportions and position on the roof. The choice of design should be informed by the character and appearance of the local vernacular.

6.3.6 Dormer windows should be visually subordinate to the roof slope, enabling a large proportion of the main roof to remain visible. Excessively wide dormers are likely to look unsatisfactory as they will often be out of proportion with the existing roof.

6.3.7 Dormer windows should normally be positioned below the ridge-line, and above the eaves line.

6.3.8 Rooflights that follow the roof profile can be an appropriate substitute for a dormer where it is important to retain the profile of the roof slope or avoid a dormer that break the eaves line. Care though needs to be taken to avoid them dominating the roof. Rooflights are best designed with a slender-profile that are flush with the roof slope.

I note the rear roofslope is characterised by a rear dormer. Therefore, dormers of a similar size would be in character with the existing dwelling and would comply with the design guide. The Conservation Officer, raised concerns in terms of impact on the historic fabric of the dwelling.

Impact on Conservation Area and Listed Building

Section 16 (2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states 'In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.'

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 directs that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a conservation area, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of state shall have special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

District Plan policy DP35 relates to Conservation Areas and states:

Development in a conservation area will be required to conserve or enhance its special character, appearance and the range of activities which contribute to it. This will be achieved by ensuring that:

- New buildings and extensions are sensitively designed to reflect the special characteristics of the area in terms of their scale, density, design and through the use of complementary materials;
- Open spaces, gardens, landscaping and boundary features that contribute to the special character of the area are protected. Any new landscaping or boundary features are designed to reflect that character;
- Traditional shop fronts that are a key feature of the conservation area are protected. Any alterations to shopfronts in a conservation area will only be permitted where they do not result in the loss of a traditional shopfront and the new design is sympathetic to the character of the existing building and street scene in which it is located;
- Existing buildings that contribute to the character of the conservation area are protected. Where demolition is permitted, the replacement buildings are of a design that reflects the special characteristics of the area;
- Activities such as markets, crafts or other activities which contribute to the special character and appearance of the conservation area are supported;
- New pavements, roads and other surfaces reflect the materials and scale of the existing streets and surfaces in the conservation area.

Development will also protect the setting of the conservation area and in particular views into and out of the area.

New buildings of outstanding or innovative design may be acceptable in conservation areas provided that their impact would not cause material harm to the area.

District Plan policy DP34 relates to listed buildings and states:

Listed Buildings

Development will be required to protect listed buildings and their settings. This will be achieved by ensuring that:

- A thorough understanding of the significance of the listed building and its setting has been demonstrated. This will be proportionate to the importance of the building and potential impact of the proposal;
- Alterations or extensions to a listed building respect its historic form, scale, setting, significance and fabric. Proposals for the conversion or change of use of a listed building retain its significance and character whilst ensuring that the building remains in a viable use;
- Traditional building materials and construction techniques are normally used. The installation of uPVC windows and doors will not be acceptable;
- Satellite antennae, solar panels or other renewable energy installations are not sited in a prominent location, and where possible within the curtilage rather than on the building itself;
- Special regard is given to protecting the setting of a listed building;
- Where the historic fabric of a building may be affected by alterations or other proposals, the applicant is expected to fund the recording or exploratory opening up of historic fabric.

The relevant Section of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is chapter 16 with the most relevant paragraphs being 208, 210, 212, 213, 214, 215 and 216 which are set out below:

208. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal

210. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

212. 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 (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

213. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

214. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

215. Where a development proposal will 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, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

The Mid Sussex Conservation Officer has commented on the application and has stated the following:

Crosskeys is a detached Grade II listed house located to the eastern side of Lindfield High Street within the Conservation Area. A comprehensive heritage statement has been submitted with the current pre-application enquiry which sets out the origins and development of the house, and discusses its significance, as well as commenting on the merits of the current pre-application proposals:

- *This statement shows that the house was first constructed during the early-mid 15th century (c.1425-1450) as a 4 bay open hall house including a central open hall of two bays, with flanking two-storey high end and service bays to either end- the high (southern) end of the building may have had a specialised function such as an office or workshop.*
- *During the late 16th century the house was modernised, and a multi-flue chimney was inserted into the cross passage at the northern end of the hall, which was floored over to create a first-floor level hall chamber. At this point it is possible that end-reversal (swapping of high and low end functions) may also have occurred, with accompanying potential alterations to partitions within the two end bays.*
- *During the early-mid 17th century the northern end of the building was rebuilt as a cross-wing, the layout of which is unclear.*

- Further changes during the 17th, 18th and early 19th centuries include the subdivision of the house into two dwellings, addition of a lean-to against the northern part of the rear wall, creation of attics with partial replacement of the roof above the southern end of the building, and creation of a cellar under the northern end. Around this time the ground floor was also underbuilt in brick.
- During the later 19th century the house was further subdivided into 3 dwellings, or 2 dwellings and a commercial unit; by 1898 it was returned to two cottages and a shop unit added to the west side of the south cottage. Around this time various alterations were carried out internally, and the southern end elevation was rebuilt in brick.
- In 1939 the property was purchased as a whole, the shop removed, and the building returned to use as a single dwelling. Further alterations associated with this included the addition of a porch, alterations to openings to the front elevation at ground floor, which was possibly rebuilt in brick at this time, rebuilding of the north end elevation in brick, reconstruction of the rear lean-to over two storeys and internal alterations.

The significance of the listed building is also set out, and is considered to be derived primarily from its early origin, layout and evolution over the course of six centuries, including the legible 15th century plan form and fabric, evidence of early modernisation, survival of the early 17th century two bay cross-wing, and later alterations reflecting changes in local social and economic conditions. I see no reason to disagree with this assessment.

The current proposal is for internal and external alterations

To consider these in turn:

Internal works:

1) At ground floor, the dining room floor level to be reduced to match the kitchen, with associated adjustments to the step and door:
From the evidence provided within the submitted Heritage Statement it seems that the fabric affected by this proposal would date from the extensive 1939 programme of alterations to the property. As such, the impact on the special interest of the building arising from this work is likely to be minimal and acceptable, subject to detail.

2) At rear ground floor, retention of one oak post to the kitchen, and removal of another:

The post which it is proposed to remove also appears to date from the 1930s and as such subject to an appropriate structural report confirming that it can be safely removed without structural damage to the building this aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious.

3) Removal of modern infill to a former door opening between kitchen and dining room and glazed panel inserted between existing timber studs:

This doorway was original to the plan form of the 17th century cross wing; the removal of the infill and installation of a glazed panel will give an enhanced appreciation of this aspect of the building's historic layout and flow, and is not considered contentious in principle subject to detail of the panel and its fixings. Care should be taken that this panel will not adversely impact surrounding fabric or evidence which the removal of the infill may reveal.

4) Adjacent to this to the kitchen side, modern finishes to the wall removed and lathe and plaster reinstated:

This aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious subject to detail. A condition requiring recording of any underlying fabric/constructional evidence which is revealed by the removal of the modern finishes may be considered.

5) At first floor to the northwestern bedroom, remove a section of lathe and plaster above the existing beam to the southern side of the room, to expose the rafters and increase the sense of height:

This part of the building appears to have a complex history. Alterations here should be carefully considered in light of the findings of the historic building survey to avoid damage to or loss of historic fabric, or fabric which contributes positively to the narrative of the house. However, the submitted Heritage Statement notes that some targeted intervention has the potential to better reveal the earlier phases of the building's development and as such the proposal for some opening up is not considered contentious in principle. Any formal application should be informed and accompanied by a detailed analysis of the adjacent/overlying fabric, and the sequence of construction and alterations to the area in question, and should be illustrated by detailed drawings including annotated existing and proposed internal elevations and sections.

6) Insert a doorway to the southeast corner of this bedroom:

The impact on historic fabric from this work appears to be currently unclear. Whilst I would not necessarily object in principle to the suggested keyhole investigations, it is therefore not possible to comment further on this aspect of the proposal at present.

7) Removal of a partition and doorway to closet to the northwest side of the stair landing:
This fabric dates from the 20th century and is not considered of special interest. This aspect of the proposal is therefore not considered contentious.

8) Alterations to plan form to create new en-suite to the northeast of the building:

The plan form to this part of the 17th century cross wing at first floor dates from the 1939 campaign of alterations, or around this time, and is not considered to be of special interest. The Heritage Statement notes a beneficial aspect through reinstatement of a partition on the line of the cross wing wall plate. This aspect of the proposal is therefore not in itself considered contentious, although it should be noted that the layout as shown appears to rely on gaining access to the northwest bedroom via the new door proposed at 6) above, and therefore if it transpires that the presence of historic fabric precludes this alteration the layout of the ensuite etc. may require reconsideration.

9) Removal of bathroom and WC in 1939 first floor extension:

This work does not affect fabric or plan form of historic interest and is not considered contentious.

10) Increase in height to two doors to first floor level:

With respect to the doorway to the hall chamber F04 this work appears to affect only 20th century fabric and as such is not considered contentious. There does not appear to be commentary within the submitted Heritage Statement with respect to the door to the cupboard adjacent to the north east side of the chimney stack- this should be included with any formal application.

11) To the northern side of the chimney stack at second floor level adjacent to the stair, removal of plasterboard and fibreboard in lieu of glazed partitions to increase visibility of chimney and crown post:

12) In association with this the ceiling above the stairwell/second floor landing (?) removed to allow views into the roof space, with plaster finishes applied to underside of existing rafters:

It is somewhat difficult to understand the detail of this aspect of the proposals on the basis of the pre-application drawings in front of us. However, I note that the Heritage Statement comments that the fabric affected is modern and that the proposal has the potential to better

reveal aspects of the building's construction which were not originally intended to be concealed. Further information would be required for a fully informed assessment, but on this basis the principle of the works may be acceptable. Any formal proposal should include a full set of detailed drawings including existing and proposed internal elevations and sections annotated to indicate the impact on/relationship of the work with the historic fabric.

13) Also at second floor, removal of a floor level beam within the room to the south of the chimney stack:

Further information on the date and level of interest of this beam will be required for any comment.

14) Removal of ceiling finishes to attic rooms to expose joists and open up views to apex of roof:

From the comments within the Heritage Statement, it would appear that the removal of the ceiling from the southern room (proposed ensuite) may be inappropriate as the potentially 18th or 19th century roof structure above this was possibly not intended to be revealed, and the existing ceiling reflects a particular phase of the building's development. Further information will be needed for informed comment, but it seems that this aspect of the proposal may therefore be contentious.

With respect to the space to the north of this (bay 2), the exposure of the 15th century ceiling and crown post may be more favourably viewed, although the possible removal of the ceiling structure in its entirety (including joists) may be preferable to just taking away the plasterboard.

In both respects further information will be required for informed comment.

15) Creation of an ensuite in the southern room at second floor level:

This work creates issues with the impact on a section of panelling to the eastern side of the room, the date and origins of which appear uncertain. Further information will be required here for informed comment, but replanning or omission of the ensuite will be preferable to potentially harmful alterations to the fabric. If the ensuite is pursued in light of these comments and those above relating to the dormer window (as opposed to an alternative use as e.g. a dressing room or study), any formal proposal should include full details in this respect, including appropriate internal elevations and sections, as well as detail of pipe runs and any other associated works.

16) Remove chimney breast, retaining external chimney stack:

This chimney appears to be historic, and of some significance to the narrative of the building. Whilst the retention of the external stack is noted, the internal chimney breast which is present at ground floor within the kitchen should also be retained as this is the only visible internal indication of the presence of the chimney, notwithstanding that it has been altered. This aspect of the proposal therefore requires reconsideration.

17) Lightening of beams throughout

This aspect of the proposal raises concerns both in terms of the impact on historic fabric, including highly important evidence of the earlier phases of the building's development (e.g. soot blackened timbers), and on the internal character of the building which is drawn in great part from the apparent age and patina of the timber framing. Therefore, whilst we may potentially consider treatment of the beams in specific locations if harmful or discordant modern finishes have been applied, in general I would be doubtful that this aspect of the proposal would be positively viewed. Further information including a detailed survey of the existing timber frame in terms of its condition, finish and the level of interest arising from this would be required for more informed comment.

External works:

18) New windows

No details appear to have been supplied in this respect, although the Heritage Statement suggests that the applicant would like to replace the existing windows, which date from c.1939, with similar windows incorporating double glazing. Whilst in some instances where relatively modern windows of little special interest are present to listed buildings their replacement with double glazed units may be regarded as acceptable in principle, in this case the windows in question are leaded casements. It will not be possible to replace these with windows of a similar style which are acceptable in their detail in the context of the listed building because this would necessitate applied or sandwiched leading. This aspect of the proposal as described is therefore likely to be regarded as contentious, and will require reconsideration.

19) Single storey extension to rear (east) of the house:

The proposal includes a substantial single storey rear extension to the house. This is shown with a stepped footprint and a flat roof with a plateau rooflight. No proposed elevations have been provided.

In my opinion, the principle of an extension of this scale to the building is contentious. Although it is noted that the extension would attach to the existing 1939 additions to the house, and would therefore not directly impact on its historic fabric, its footprint and potential bulk appears such that it would have an inappropriate relationship of scale with the historic core of the building, particularly when the cumulative impact with the existing two storey additions is considered. In the existing context, in my view the scope for further extension to the building is limited, however it may be that a significantly more modest addition, omitting the study and drawing back the proposed rear building line of the dining room may be more favourably viewed.

I also note the point made within the Heritage Statement that excavation works associated with the new extension may adversely impact on archaeological remains- this should be borne in mind in the development and consideration of any formal application.

20) Two new dormer windows to the rear roofslope:

This aspect of the proposal is in my opinion likely to prove contentious, for reasons both of potential impact on historic fabric, and on the appearance of the building. The submitted Heritage Statement considers that there may be more scope for introduction of a new dormer window to the southern end of the roof, where fabric may be later in date, but I would question the need for either window when one (to the north) is to an attic space which would appear to be intended for storage use and the other (to the south) is to a proposed ensuite. The potential loss of fabric and visual impact would appear unjustified, and I would recommend that these works are omitted from any formal application. Should the applicant choose to pursue either one or both windows further, more detailed information on the date and level of interest of the fabric affected would be required for a fully informed assessment.

21) Installation of a plateau rooflight to the existing flat roof at the centre of the 1939 rear extension:

This aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious subject to detail.

22) Addition of two rooflights to either side of the roof of the northern cross-wing:

The Heritage Statement notes that these appear to be shown lying within the roof to the two storey 1939 rear extension to the cross-wing. The exact position with respect to this more modern vs the 17th century fabric should be clarified in any formal proposal, however subject

to confirmation that it is the 1930s roof which is affected, this aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious in principle. As per the recommendations within the Heritage Statement the rooflights should be set above or between the rafters rather than inserted by cutting them, and an appropriate treatment to the underside of the 1930s roof structure, if it is intended to open up the space into the roof, proposed. Any formal application should naturally contain greater detail in respect of these issues, including appropriate annotated internal elevations and sections to illustrate the work.

23) Alterations and extensions to the existing garage building:

Whilst these are not considered contentious in principle I note and would agree with the comments made within the Heritage Statement regarding the alignment of the extension relative to the boundary. Elevations would be required to comment on the detail of the design, including the proposed solar PV panels which as noted in the Heritage Statement may potentially impact not only the setting of the application property but also its neighbours and the wider character of the Conservation Area.

24) New or altered hard landscaping around the house and garage:

Whilst reconfiguration of the existing landscaping may not be considered contentious in principle the extent of new hard landscaping appears excessive and may detract from the verdant garden setting of the listed building, which also contributes positively to the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. This part of the proposal therefore requires reconsideration.

25) New garden building and summer house:

Whilst these aspects of the proposal are unlikely to prove contentious in principle, further information including elevations would be required for informed comment.

26) New gates in a revised position forward of the existing:

These are unlikely to prove contentious subject to detail.

In summary, although aspects of the proposal may be favourably viewed, others including the rear extension, dormers, and some of the internal works require reconsideration or omission from the scheme. In other areas, further information would be required for informed comment.

Any formal proposal would be assessed against the requirements of District Plan Policies DP34 and DP35, the Council's adopted Design Statement, and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

The internal works elements are related solely to any submitted Listed Building Consent application. As noted above elements of the works are deemed unacceptable to the listed building officer.

In terms of listed building and its setting, the conservation officer has concerns with the proposed rear extension, hard landscaping and new rear dormers.

Neighbouring Amenities

DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan is most relevant and in part states that a proposal is acceptable where it:

Does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, and noise, air and light pollution (see Policy DP29).

Without elevations it is difficult to assess the impact on neighbouring amenities, but I would doubt from the proposal details provided, that significant harm will be caused to neighbouring amenities.

Conclusion

If you wish to proceed, you will need to submit a joint Householder Planning Application and a Listed Building Consent.

As raised, elements of the proposal are seen as potentially unacceptable in terms of impact on the listed building and the Conservation Area.

The views in this email are at officer level only and do not prejudice the Council from making whatever decision it considers appropriate on any application subsequently submitted.

The information contained in pre-planning advice may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Unless the information contained is legally exempt from disclosure, we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this advice to a third party making a request for information about the subject matter.

Kind regards,