

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 12 November 2025 11:00:23 UTC+00:00
To: "Caroline Grist" <Caroline.Grist@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/25/2289 Mulberries, Lewes Road, HK

Hi Caroline

Further comments on the above application following the receipt of an expanded heritage statement.

The revised statement suggests that the removal of the stack is desirable to the applicant as it would facilitate internal alterations. These works would not be impossible were the stack retained above roof level, but additional structural support would be necessary.

In my opinion, this is not a sufficiently robust justification for the loss of the chimney. Paragraph 213 of the NPPF requires that *'Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset... should require clear and convincing justification.'* I have already identified a low level of less than substantial harm to both the Horsted Keynes Conservation Area and, through impact on setting, to the adjacent listed building at Rixons, which would result from the removal of the chimney, for the reasons which I have previously set out. Whilst I appreciate that the retention of the chimney above roof level would result in a degree of inconvenience and additional expense for the applicants, who I note have invested considerably in the property, this does not constitute the required *'clear and convincing justification'* for the harm which would result.

'Before and after' photographs are included in the expanded Statement, which I have reviewed, however they do not alter my opinion regarding the impact of the proposal.

The applicant has also included two suggested precedents for the current proposal in the form of previously approved applications. The first, Horton Villa, is not located within the Conservation Area. The second permission, for removal of a chimney at Hurst Cottage, which is within the Area, related to a secondary stack located towards the rear of the property. Although Street View suggests that it will have been visible from the road, it was not as visually prominent as the ridge top stack which is the subject of the current application. There also appears to have been historical work internally to the property which rendered the chimney structurally unsound. For these reasons, and notwithstanding that each case must be regarded on its own merits, I do not consider that these approvals have direct relevance to the current case.

For these reasons, my previous conclusions regarding the merits of the proposal are unaltered.

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
Sent: 20 October 2025 14:37
To: Caroline Grist <Caroline.Grist@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/25/2289 Mulberries, Lewes Road, HK

Hi Caroline

Comments on the above planning application.

The application site, Mulberries, is an unlisted detached house located within the Horsted Keynes Conservation Area. Adjacent to the site to the north east is Rixons, a Grade II listed timber framed house dating from the 17th century. Mulberries, which from historic map regression dates from the mid 20th century, is in a loosely vernacular style, with brick and hung tile elevations, and a tiled roof with a catslide to the eastern end, and a recessed porch with tiled hood. The building has been extended and altered, including by the addition of a flat roofed garage to the east, and a conservatory addition to the north west corner.

The current proposal is for the demolition of one of the two chimneys to the property.

Firstly, I would note that although the submitted Heritage Statement suggests that a justification for the work is provided in the form of a copy of previous email correspondence, the emails attached do not appear to include any reason for the work. If I have missed something please let me know, otherwise the applicant may wish to submit this separately if they would like it to form part of our consideration of the proposal.

In the absence of a compelling justification for the loss of the chimney, it is in my opinion contentious in principle. Although the property is relatively modern, it is constructed in a vernacular style sympathetic to the character of the Conservation Area. The presence of chimneys contributes to the roofline interest of the building and to its traditional design. The loss of one of the chimneys would detract from the character and appearance of the building and of the wider Area, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35.

The loss of the chimney, in adversely impacting the appearance of Mulberries, would also have a minor negative impact on the contribution that the building makes to the setting of Rixons, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34.

In terms of the NPPF, the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to both heritage assets, at the lower end of that scale.

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