

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 November 2025 16:33:51 UTC+00:00
To: "Andrew Horrell" <Andrew.Horrell@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/25/2587 and 2588 Chatesgrove, Cross Colwood Lane, Bolney

Hi Andrew

Comments on the above planning and listed building consent applications.

Chatesgrove is a Grade II listed building located in a rural position outside Bolney. The house, which dates originally from the early 17th century, is of an L shaped plan to the historic core, but was substantially extended to its northern end during the early 20th century.

Planning permission and listed building consent were granted in 2018 for works including a part one, part two storey extension with a cellar beneath. This addition took the form of a modest extension to the side (north) of the building which sat under a continuation of the existing hipped roof, forming a catslide, with the cellar beneath this, and to the rear (west of the house) a further extension over two storeys, creating a slightly projecting wing under a hipped roof. These permissions do not appear to have been implemented and are assumed to have lapsed.

The current proposal is for single storey additions to the north and west of the house. To the north, a substantial pitched roof extension is proposed extending across the majority of the existing side elevation of the house (with a slight set back from the front elevation) and for some distance beyond this to the rear, beyond the existing rear building line which is established by the western elevation of the historic core of the house. A further flat roofed orangery style extension is proposed sitting between this and the north western corner of the 17th century core of the building, wrapping around and attaching to the western elevation of the original house.

Although these extensions are single storey, they are over a significantly enlarged footprint in comparison with the previous approval and are considerably greater in overall bulk. In my opinion, this results in an unacceptable relationship of scale between the historic core of the building and the additions to it, particularly bearing in mind the cumulative impact of these extensions with the existing very substantial early 20th century wing.

This adverse impact is exacerbated by the depth of the projection of the additions to the rear (west) side of the building, in that they project beyond the historic rear building line of the house. This increases the undue visual prominence of the extensions in relation to the 17th century house.

Furthermore, the current proposal in the manner in which the orangery extension abuts and extends beyond the north elevation of the historic core, and wraps around to attach to its western elevation, blurs the differentiation between the 17th century house and the 20th century extension, and has an adverse impact on the manner in which the surviving historic fabric of the elevations concerned can be seen and appreciated. A potential for damage to the fabric from the attachment of the extension would also be present.

Aspects of the form and detailed design of the proposed extensions are also in my opinion contentious:

- The roof forms of both elements are not sympathetic to the context. The gables to the northern elevation, although intended to mimic the existing gables to the house, are greater in scale and therefore exacerbate the undue visual prominence of this elevation. The long, gabled roof form also appears awkward juxtaposed with the hipped roof of the existing house. It should be noted that this existing roof is 20th century, not 17th century in date (as suggested in the submitted heritage statement) and thus the existing permission did not result in any direct impact on the more historic fabric of the house. The extensive flat roof proposed to the rear is also not a sympathetic response to the existing roof forms of the house.
- Aspects of the detailing, including the fenestration, to both elements are also considered unsympathetic to the context.

For these reasons, I consider that the proposal detracts from the special interest of the listed building, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. In terms of the NPPF, I would place the harm as less than substantial, at the mid-high range of that scale, such that the balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 will apply. I would also consider the proposal contrary to the requirements of the Council's adopted Design Guide, specifically Design Principles DG49, DG50 and DG51.

I would recommend that the applicant withdraw the current applications and engage in pre-application discussions with the Council in relation to an alternative scheme, which should be significantly reduced in scale and set away from the historic core of the building. I would also advise that the applicant commission an appropriately detailed historic building survey by an appropriately qualified and experienced historic building archaeologist to inform and accompany any revised proposal. If helpful, I can provide details of companies providing this service within the Mid Sussex area.

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



No ID? You can apply for free voter ID
Find out more at

electoralcommission.org.uk/voterID

or call 0800 328 0280