

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 September 2026 16:48:04 UTC+01:00
To: "Tracie Axford" <Tracie.Axford@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Southern Breach, High Street, Cuckfield DM/26/1579 and 1588

Hi Tracie

Comments on the above listed building consent and planning applications.

Southern Breach is a detached Grade II listed house located to the east side of Cuckfield High Street, within the Conservation Area. According to the list description, the house dates to the 18th century, but was refronted during the 19th century. The adjacent buildings to the south (Maltmans North and Maltmans South), which date from the late 16th century, are also Grade II listed. Some of the proposed works would also potentially impact on the settings of these buildings.

The current proposal is for alterations and extensions externally and internally, comprising:

- A single storey side extension to the house, sitting to the side of the existing rear wing, under a glazed lean-to roof;
- A dormer extension to the rear roofslope, sitting behind the lower of the three chimneys, and providing additional headroom to an ensuite bedroom;
- Installation of a EV charging point to the rear elevation adjacent to the above mentioned chimney stack;
- Internally at ground floor creation of an enlarged opening to the wall between the kitchen/dining and family rooms;
- Potentially the replacement of windows throughout the building (see below); and
- Removal of an existing green house and creation of a swimming pool with associated landscaping.

Firstly, I would note that the submitted heritage statement is insufficient to allow a fully informed assessment of the impact of the proposal on the plan form and fabric of the building. I would recommend that a revised and expanded statement is requested, which should be based on an appropriately detailed historic building survey. This work should be undertaken by an appropriately qualified and experienced historic building archaeologist.

Based on the limited information before us, I would have the following initial comments on the proposal. These are likely to be subject to expansion and/or revision on receipt of the expanded heritage statement:

- The side extension attaches to the side elevation of the existing rear wing. A brief historic map regression exercise suggests that this wing dates largely from the early 20th century, although it may incorporate an earlier outbuilding which is shown on maps from the 19th century, which could possibly have been retained

and linked to the house. A historic building survey should illuminate this aspect of the house's development, and will be necessary for informed comment as to the impact of the loss of fabric from the side of the wing which forms part of the proposal. However, notwithstanding the outcome of this, I have concerns regarding the form of the addition as shown, which disrupts the characteristic linear form of the rear wing, and its design which includes an entirely unrelieved elevation to the southern side facing onto the rear courtyard area. These aspects of the addition are unsympathetic to the host building, and detract from its special interest. They are also detrimental to the contribution made by Southern Breach to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and to the setting of Maltmans North and South, which the addition faces directly towards.

- The proposed dormer extension also in my opinion raises concerns. More detailed comment would be possible following the receipt of the historic building survey and expanded heritage statement, however our site inspection strongly suggested that the construction of the dormer would result in unacceptable loss of historic fabric from the characteristic rear catslide, including a currently exposed beam within the ensuite room. In addition, the scale and placement of the dormer will result in an awkward visual relationship with the lower of the house's three chimneys, which it would sit directly behind. I also consider that the dormer is overscaled in isolation of this consideration, with reference to the Council's adopted Design Guide.
- The proposed EV charging point is not considered contentious subject to detail, to include detail of the unit itself and of any associated cabling, which should be sited so as to minimise both its visual prominence and any loss of historic fabric.
- The enlarged opening between the kitchen/dining and family rooms is difficult to comment on in the absence of the more detailed information on the date and level of interest of the fabric which would be provided by a historic building survey. If the fabric is confirmed as dating from the early 20th century then the opening may not be considered contentious, subject to detail, but if earlier fabric survives, for example from a retained earlier outbuilding forming part of the rear wing, then its loss may not be favourably viewed.
- On site, the applicant mentioned their intention to replace the windows throughout the house. At present, this work is not included within the application drawings or documents. This proposal, which would require both planning permission and listed building consent (given the Article 4 Direction which is in place), as well as existing and proposed elevations, should be accompanied by a detailed window-by-window survey of the existing windows to the property, which should include information on the age, level of interest, and state of repair of each window it is proposed to replace. This aspect of the works should also be discussed in the revised and expanded heritage statement. Ideally, typical existing and proposed large scale elevations and sections of each window type (including glazing bar detail) would also be provided, although it may be possible that this information could be reserved by condition.
- The existing greenhouse is not of any particular interest, and its removal is not considered contentious. Given the centre village, residential context of the site, the introduction of a swimming pool of modest proportions is likewise not

considered contentious subject to detail, as the house has a generous garden and sufficient verdant space would be retained. However, no information regarding the nature and location of the associated plant appears to have been provided- will this require some sort of housing? This needs to be confirmed at this stage.

In summary, the proposal as submitted raises concerns both in terms of the level of information provided and of the potential impact on the special interest of Southern Breach, the settings of Maltman's North and Maltman's South, and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. I can provide further comments when the further information set out above is provided.

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