

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 16 July 2025 12:56:18 UTC+01:00
To: "Caroline Grist" <Caroline.Grist@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: 1 The Calf Unit, Bowders Farm, Horsted Keynes DM/24/3139

Hi Caroline

Further comments on the above planning application.

Firstly, I would note that given the number of inconsistencies between the notes in the Heritage Statement and the pre-existing elevations submitted which are highlighted below, it seems that the latter need to be reviewed and corrected. I'd suggest that cross-referencing a revised resubmission with pre-existing photographs would be useful.

We have received a Heritage Statement which includes consideration of the historical development of the farmstead, including the buildings in question and the adjacent listed farmhouse. As well as commenting on the works which have taken place, and the further works proposed it also contains a discussion around the curtilage of listing. Whilst I do not find these arguments entirely convincing (for example I am not sure that the point regarding the presence of a garden wall and track would preclude the farmstead being considered within the curtilage of the house, given the intentional proximity of the two), I note that the buildings were not in the same ownership at the time of listing, which I think is more fundamental point. On that basis, on balance, I would agree that the historic buildings within the farmstead should not be regarded as curtilage listed, although I would regard them as NDHAs which have group value with, and contribute positively to the setting of Bowders Farmhouse.

To consider the works as completed and further works as proposed in turn, based largely on the ordering of the annotated drawings within the Statement:

- The removal of the modern barn and courtyard roof structure.
I would agree that these works are not contentious, and that they do enhance the setting of the more historic farm courtyard.
- North elevation, stables
The existing windows and doors have been replaced with black wood grain effect uPVC to this elevation, and throughout. The Statement notes that these were previously timber framed windows and a solid timber door. In my opinion, as set out in my previous comments, the use of uPVC on these historic farm buildings will be unacceptable without a robust justification. Given that the previous windows and doors were timber, there is no apparent justification for the use of this non-traditional, unsympathetic material in this location, where it detracts from the significance of the NDHA and its contribution to the setting of the listed farmhouse. I would therefore recommend that the new uPVC windows and doors throughout the building should be replaced with painted timber units of an appropriate design.

The right hand opening as shown is described in the notes within the Statement as being previously solid timber, but on the pre-existing elevations is shown as French windows. The replacement doors are uPVC French windows. The use of French windows where they were not previously present may not be favourably viewed, as these tend to have a domesticating impact on the character of the building, so this requires clarification.

- North elevation, cart shed and barns

Again, the use of uPVC to the replacement windows and doors is considered contentious.

- East elevation, cart sheds

Again, the use of uPVC in place of the pre-existing timber windows and doors noted is considered contentious. The proposal to introduce timber cladding over existing blockwork infill of the cart shed openings is however not considered problematic, providing this is detailed to allow the original posts to remain exposed, as the elevation suggests.

- East elevation, stables and cart sheds

The use of uPVC to windows and doors is again unacceptable. The rebuilt courtyard wall appears to be conjectural, but is not considered contentious subject to detail.

- South elevation, cart sheds

See above re. use of uPVC. I note the loss of a stable door, which while not described of being of any age, would have contributed to the character of the building. This is not consistent with the appearance of the doors on the pre-existing elevations submitted, which are shown as fully glazed. This requires clarification. Replacement timber doors should be of a sympathetic design. The blockwork to the bottom half of the left hand opening as shown was, I thought from our discussions on site- introduced as part of the recent works? Can the applicant please clarify? If so, we would expect that this should be replaced with brick rather than overclad, as the opening is not original and it will be preferable although the historic brickwork has been lost to at least replace it on a like-for-like basis.

- East elevation, stables and barn

See above re. the use of uPVC, with the exception of the left-hand window as shown, which is noted to have been previously white uPVC dating from 2007. In this one instance the retention of the black wood grained window as installed will be acceptable.

- West elevation, cart sheds and barn

See above re. the use of uPVC, with the exception of the one window to the right hand side which was previously this material.

The partial infilling of the original door opening is not acceptable- this should be removed and the opening re-instated. A door of an appropriate design could be placed in the opening and fixed shut, if preferred. Again, the pre-existing elevations submitted do not appear to be correct in this respect and require revision.

The new window opening introduced at the centre of the elevation is modest in scale and respects the proportions of the other existing openings. Although there

will have been some loss of fabric involved, this is considered acceptable in principle, but as above the window unit and frame require replacement with painted timber.

Given the previously existing asbestos rainwater goods, the use of plastic in this instance is considered on balance acceptable.

The repairs to the barn including replacement cladding, and the cleaning and repointing of brickwork are not considered contentious subject to detail.

I would also just reiterate the point made previously regarding the parking area adjacent to the courtyard, and the need for further screening planting etc. This remains pertinent.

In summary, although the principle of the conversion remains acceptable, aspects of the detail of the scheme are not, including in particular the use of uPVC to windows and doors, and some of the works to openings. The pre-existing plans and elevations also appear inaccurate and may require revision.

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