

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 March 2026 15:30:11 UTC+00:00
To: "Katherine Williams" <Katherine.Williams@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: DM/25/1419 and 1563 Brook Street Farm

Hi Katherine

Further comments on the above discharge of conditions application. For simplicity I have added these in red to the initial comments below.

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>



From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 July 2025 17:40
To: Katherine Williams <Katherine.Williams@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/25/1419 and 1563 Brook Street Farm

Hi Katherine

Comments on the above discharge of conditions applications. Numbering as per the planning application, as given in the condition discharge document.

Firstly, I note that the submitted proposed elevations do not match the approved elevations in all respects. For example, a window has been added to the southern elevation of the stables, a stove flue pipe has been added to the southern roof slope of the cartshed, and the glazing pattern to the windows as shown does not in many cases match the approved.

Condition 3 Facing and roofing materials

The details as submitted are acceptable.

Condition 4

Windows

As noted above, the glazing pattern shown on the submitted elevations does not match the approved elevations. In addition, metal casements are shown instead of timber as approved. Although a manufacturer's name and product range is quoted in the submitted covering document, we do not have the detailed drawings requested by the condition. In some locations, as approved, the existing glazing pattern was to be replicated, which is not shown on the elevations before us and will result in a loss of character. The proposed use of a consistent multipane glazing pattern throughout has in some instances a domesticating effect. No details of depth of reveal have been provided. The use of an off the shelf metal framed product does not equate with the *'New joiner made glazed units... proposed throughout'* as noted in the approved DAS, either in the compatibility of the material with the existing building or in the capability to preserve its character.

The design of the windows has in general reverted to the approved, which is welcomed. The majority are shown as timber casements, although those to the west elevation are shown as Crittall. I am not sure what the logic is behind this, but I would suggest that there is no reason why these should not also be timber as per the approval. As the agent is aware, we will need to see detailed drawings including elevations and sections, and showing depth of reveal.

Internal and external doors

For the external doors no details appear to have been provided beyond a manufacturer and range, we have no detailed drawings as requested and not even a link to the specific product. Again, the material is not as approved, as noted above the glazing pattern shown on the approved drawings is not reflected in the elevations before us now, and the use of multipane glazing has in some instances a domesticating effect. No details of depth of reveal is provided, which should be shown on the detailed drawings requested.

The proposed external doors are shown as metal framed. Given that these are in part overlain by timber shutters, I would not object to this in principle. However, I remain of the opinion that the multi-pane glazing to the new external doors is not appropriate in style being too domesticated and would recommend that the applicant revert to the approved, simpler design in this respect. As the agent is aware, we will need to see the detailed drawings including sections and depth of reveal required by the wording of the condition.

Eaves detail to each element of the building

These appear generally acceptable but the material to the rainwater goods should be noted.
(This should be painted metal)

The drawings are annotated '*timber rafters to structural engineer's spec.*' It should be noted that the structural engineer's drawings do not indicate a wholesale replacement of the rafters, so this annotation is somewhat misleading and would benefit from being rephrased.

It would be helpful if the applicant could clarify this point as it is not specifically addressed in the covering email. I don't believe we have received revised eaves details?

Platform and steps to the rear of the building

- The details as submitted are acceptable.

New flooring throughout

In general this is considered acceptable, however it was anticipated that the timber floor boards to the granary would be lifted and relaid in their existing positions, with repairs as necessary. Can the applicant please provide a justification for the alternative proposal of relaying the boards only within the northern bedroom?

I believe the granary floor is now to be retained and repaired throughout, including the bathroom- this is implied by the note to plan DA 0110 B - however it would be helpful if the agent could confirm this as it is not mentioned in the covering email. Subject to this confirmation, this aspect of the proposal is now considered acceptable.

Condition 5: Insulation

- The approach as shown appears generally acceptable, however as per the wording of the condition detailed drawings should be provided including internal elevations of walls and roof to show the extent of the fabric which will be retained exposed.

Further drawings have been provided and are acceptable. This condition can now be discharged.

Condition 6: Repairs to the timber frame and Condition 7: Repairs to the foundations

- These conditions are addressed by a pack of structural drawings, a specification and design statement. In general, the repair works to the frame, and the associated works to stabilise the foundations of the stables and granary buildings are considered acceptable- although extensive interventions are proposed, a relatively conservative approach seems to be taken with respect to the historic fabric, retaining and doubling up rafters, for example, rather than replacing them.

The supporting specification notes that: '*The structural engineering drawings show the anticipated scope of structural repairs to the timber frame. Once the inspections by the timber framer have been completed, this scope may need to be adjusted.*' Whilst it is understandable that the full scope of repairs may not become apparent until the cladding to the walls and the

roof covering are removed, allowing full access to the frame, it should be noted that should additional work not covered by the drawings submitted with this discharge of conditions application become necessary, it may be necessary to submit a further application for listed building consent, or to re-apply to discharge this condition (as the Case Officer advises is practical in planning procedural terms), depending on the nature and extent of this work. I would suggest an informative or covering note to the applicant to this affect, on any eventual discharge of conditions.

At the moment however, there is a significant element of concern which forms part of the structural submission, which is the suggestion that the first floor accommodation within the stable cannot be accommodated without introduction of either a new supporting steel frame and foundations, or a combination of a load bearing wall with footings and steelwork, due to the increased loading associated with the conversion works. Either option is likely to have an impact on the internal appearance and/or fabric of the building.

This is unfortunate, particularly given the emphasis that was put on the need to establish the capability of the building for conversion during the course of the original applications. This intervention goes beyond the repairs that were indicated in the approved scheme, and in my opinion may require a new application for listed building consent.

At present, two options are provided in this respect. It would help if the applicant could clarify which option they are choosing to pursue, and provide more detail in respect of that option, so that an informed decision in this respect can be taken.

Further information regarding the new foundations which are proposed to support the structure have been provided. Although it would appear that some replacement of the overlying historic fabric will be required (e.g. plinth walls and sill plates in some locations), it appears that the intervention to the existing structure will be relatively minimal. On this basis, this aspect of the proposal is now considered acceptable.

With respect to the first floor accommodation within the stable, it would appear that the proposal has been refined to consist of strengthening works to the existing frame, with the new joists to bear on the top face of the existing tie beam/wall plate (Dwg. nos. 0142/18 B and 12 B). This is a less invasive approach, which is considered acceptable in terms of its impact on the special interest of the building.

Condition 8: Bathroom layout

The details as provided are acceptable.

Condition 9: External pipework and tile vents

In general the information provided is acceptable. I note the boiler flue to the rear (north facing) elevation but given its small scale and rearward facing position this is considered acceptable. I think it is just about reasonable to regard this as pipework, given its association with the plumbing to the conversion, subject to the Case Officer's agreement?

However the proposed stove flue to the front south facing roof slope is a large and visually prominent addition which is not part of the approved scheme (see above) and cannot in my opinion be considered under the umbrella of 'pipework'. This would in my opinion require further

applications for listed building consent and planning permission, which given the relative prominence of this elevation and its domesticating nature may not be forthcoming. I would suggest this is omitted from the application drawings.

The proposed stove pipe has been removed from the scheme.

Condition 11 Hard and soft landscaping scheme

The details as provided are acceptable.

Condition 17 Lighting for biodiversity

No objection on heritage grounds to the design or placement of the external lighting.

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