

From: Emily Wade
Sent: 11 May 2026 14:21:06 UTC+01:00
To: "Hamish Evans" <Hamish.Evans@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/25/1708 and 1709 and DM/25/1705 and 1706 Sunte House

Hi Hamish

Further comments on the above applications- my apologies for the delay in getting these to you, which has been caused by pressure of other work.

DM/25/1705 and 1706 (Works to house and gardens)

Further plans/comments received:

- Email received from Kai Penny dated 10th February with comments in blue. Attached extract from revised DAS and note from Robinson Wild (Heritage Statement Addendum).
- Email received from Kai Penny dated 10th March mainly referring to the farm courtyard applications but with attached supporting document which refers to the house extension.
- Further consult response from Luciana at HE dated 27th of March stating that their position has not altered from their previous letter dated 12th January, i.e. they continue to object to elements of the proposal, specifically the extent of glazing to the dairy link. Seeking confirmation that the driveway and parking works are now removed from the application, in favour of an LDC. Window works acceptable subject to adherence to relevant guidance.

With respect to the internal works to the house relating to the creation of the rear hallway to the north of the service stair, and to the north facing windows to the pool house, the applicant repeats or makes further arguments in support of the works but has not provided amended plans. I do not consider that the arguments presented overcome these issues, which continue to require reconsideration. Specifically, with respect to the hallway it was previously acknowledged that the surviving historic fabric to this part of the building is fragmentary, due to the extent of previous alterations, but in my opinion this enhances rather than reduces the value of what remains. With respect to the north facing windows to the pool house, I have stated repeatedly my opinion that the enclosed, inward looking nature of the walled garden area should be respected by any proposal in this area. I have previously objected to similar windows to earlier iterations of the scheme, and that objection and the reasons behind it remains pertinent.

With respect to the extent of glazing to the link my personal view, as I have stated before, is not entirely aligned with that of Historic England, but I do see that they have a valid argument. As a statutory consultee, their views hold great weight, and it is

disappointing that the applicant has chosen not to address the concerns raised. This also raises a potential procedural issue; see below.

Aside from the issue with the roof to the extension, and assuming that the parking and driveway is now withdrawn from the application, we would also need to see the further information requested by HE to ensure that the proposed window replacement is in alignment with the relevant guidance quoted by Luciana, specifically a strategy based on the addendum to the Heritage Statement dated 19th December which included further information on the date and condition of the windows affected. I would however be happy for this to be required by condition, as previously stated, and I do not see that this needs to hold up the progress of the applications.

These remaining issues seem to me relatively easy to resolve, and I hope that the applicant will be willing to address them to overcome our and HE's remaining concerns, so that the applications can move forward. I note that Luciana's response of 12th January is worded that HE has no objection on heritage grounds, '*subject to the issues identified in our advice being addressed in order to avoid or further reduce harm to the significance of the listed building and to meet the requirements of paragraph 208 of the NPPF.*' I would take it to mean that if these issues are not fully addressed (and they have not been to date, particularly with respect to the link roof, where there has been no further movement), we would have to consider that there is an extant objection from HE, which is a highly relevant material consideration.

DM/25/1708 and 1709 (Works to barn and farm courtyard).

- Email received from Kai Penny dated 10th February with attached supporting document from Robinson Wild which refers to the farm courtyard.
-
- Email received from Kai Penny dated 10th March mainly referring to the farm courtyard applications and with comments in blue to my previous responses. Attached supporting document.
- The most recent response from HE is dated 12th January- this raises concerns on heritage grounds to the proposals, which have not been subsequently amended.

The applicant has indicated that they would be prepared to consider the use of clay tiles in place of zinc to the roof of the extension to the barn, which is a positive step in terms of addressing the objections raised by Historic England in this respect. However no change is proposed to the glazed elevations, and HE's latest letter states unequivocally that: '*the conversion scheme for the barn should be amended reduce the amount of glazing in the proposed extension, in accordance with our advice, to meet the requirements of paragraph 208 of the NPPF.*' Although as with the courtyard extension to the house my own views do not entirely align with HE on this point, I can again see their argument and would suggest that the applicant reconsider, and address the issues raised.

In respect of the concerns previously raised by the Council, no amendments appear to have been made although further arguments in support of the scheme as it stands have been submitted. Although I have read and considered these points, I remain of the opinion, as repeatedly expressed, that the conversion scheme for the farm courtyard buildings requires amendment to retain more of their traditional, agricultural character, irrespective of the extent of alterations which have already taken place. Please refer to my previous comments in this respect.

In relation to the barn, alongside the points raised by Historic England I remain of the opinion that more of the framing at ground floor to the south side should be retained where the openings to the extension are proposed. I note the applicant's argument regarding the extent of previous work to the building but even if of re-used timbers, this framing contributes positively to the character of the building- it is a key aspect of that character- and there is no justification for the extent of removal currently shown. Again, an internal elevation as previously requested would be helpful to demonstrate the works to this part of the barn.

In summary, with the exception of the potential revision of the roofing material to the barn extension, there has been little movement in the position with respect to these applications, which is regrettable. Objections from Historic England and from ourselves therefore still stand.

Thanks,

Emily

Please note that this advice is given at Officer level only and is without prejudice to the formal decision of the District Council.

Submit your planning application online.
<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk>

Emily Wade Ma MSc
Conservation Officer
Planning Services
Tel: +44 (0)1444 477385
emily.wade@midsussex.gov.uk <http://www.midsussex.gov.uk>

The
Electoral
Commission

You now need
photo ID to
vote at a
polling station

No ID? You can apply for free voter ID

Find out more at

electoralcommission.org.uk/voterID

or call 0800 328 0280