

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 September 2025 14:40:00 UTC+01:00
To: "Katherine Williams" <Katherine.Williams@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Barlands DM/24/2943 and 2944

Hi Katherine

Further comments on the above application following the receipt of a response from the agent and a further Heritage Statement. For ease I will add these in **green** to the previous comments below, as these cover the outstanding issues with the application.

In summary, notwithstanding the further comments by the architect and the revised HS, the proposal remains in my opinion unacceptable in terms of its impact on the special interest of the listed farmhouse and curtilage listed stables, for the reasons set out again below and in my previous comments. This will be contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. The works would result in less than substantial harm to the house and to the stables building, at around the mid-high range of that scale in both cases.

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: 25 June 2025 16:20
To: Katherine Williams <Katherine.Williams@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Barlands DM/24/2943 and 2944

Hi Katherine

Further comments on the above application following the receipt of further information and sketch revisions. For ease of reference, I have copied Rob's notes below and added my own comments in red.

- The new glazed partition will sit beneath the oak timber beams in the same manner as the proposals recently discussed and agreed at Old Keysford Hall, which we trust will be acceptable in this instance. The attached photographs illustrate the acknowledged point that a wall would previously have been present here, and the proposed partition will seek to leave the existing mortises exposed to identify this;
With respect to the proposed internal works, a revised and expanded heritage statement was requested but appears not to have been received? The previous comments remain pertinent- subject to an expanded HS, this work may be acceptable, but we would need to see details to confirm that the installation of the glazing can be accomplished without damage to overlying or adjoining historic fabric.
We now have a revised HS which supports the reinstallation of a partition in this position- had the application been otherwise acceptable further detail of the partition and its relationship with the historic beam and mortises would be required, as this does not appear to have been supplied? The revised HS mentions amendments to the scheme in respect of the position of the partition, and details of the design of the glazed screen, but I don't think we have seen these drawings?
- In respect of the nib to be cut back, some minor investigations have confirmed that this is of modern construction, comprising a modern lightweight blockwork wall with a void encased in modern plasterboard. The attached photographs confirm this. The removal of this nib will not therefore result in the loss of any historic building fabric;
This work may therefore be acceptable, but should be considered by a fully detailed HS, and the location of this nib on the plan requires clarification as per previous comments.
The revised HS supports the suggestion that the affected fabric is modern, and therefore there would be no objection in principle to this work, although I would reiterate that it needs to be clearly shown on the plans- it does not appear that we have revised drawings in this respect?
- The existing door will be retained in situ, but fixed shut;
Noted, and acceptable.
No further comment.
- The current link extension has been reworked to address the concerns raised. The Kitchen extension is now arranged in a simple rectangular form to appear as an extension to the north elevation of the Farmhouse. The façade treatment of this will be very much akin to the current proposal, with large areas of full-height glazing, facing brickwork, and a green roof behind its standing-seam zinc fascia;
- The Kitchen extension uses full height glazing, set back from the primary west elevation, to assist in appearing subservient to the existing dwelling. The full height glazing demonstrates a respectful 'light touch' approach;

- The Kitchen extension has also been moved further away from the eastern boundary to align with the Privy to the east end of the Stables. To the west, the extension aligns with the western reveal of the Utility Room door. These two locations have been deliberately selected as the datums for its extents as it demonstrates how respectful the extension is to its existing environment;
- The stairs for accessing the extension from the house would be included in a small lean-to extension elevated to match the façade treatment of the existing house. This would mimic a small Porch extension;
- The Kitchen extension is linked to the Stables by way of a structural glass link, designed to be transparent to maintain the view through to the farmyard beyond. This link will incorporate a primary entrance door on its west elevation, meaning that on approaching from the driveway one's view is guided towards the farmyard. This will be a permanent reminder of the historic connection between the two entities. This principle is very much of there being the 'potential' for views towards the farmyard, as the fence (erected by the neighbour) currently restricts this;
 We have been provided with a revised sketch scheme in plan for the proposed rear extension along the lines described above. However I remain of the opinion that the addition as shown would be overscaled and overbearing in its relationship with the original building, and the issues over the principle of linking the stables to the house, and of the addition of any substantial extension to the rear of the building, which largely retains its historic form and footprint, remain relevant. I am likewise unconvinced by the argument that the proposed glazed link between the rear extension and stables will be sufficient to retain a meaningful visual relationship between the farmhouse and its former farmstead. No revised elevations have been received to indicate that the previously identified issues with the elevational treatment of the extension have been addressed. Unfortunately this aspect of the proposal therefore remains in my opinion contentious.
 A further revised scheme has been provided within the 'Response to Queries' document received 28/07, which appears to indicate a slight further reduction in the scale of the rear extension to the house compared to the version seen in May, although the reduction in footprint is modest. The link to the stables is retained, and an indicative partial elevation is provided. There is some discussion also within the document regarding materials, and how these would relate to the context, as well as consideration of potential visibility if the extension from the road. These amendments and further information are not in my opinion sufficient to address the concerns previously raised, including the principle of linking from the house to the stables building, and the scale of the proposed rear addition, the excessive depth of which is illustrated by the elevation provided. The glass link between the rear extension and the stables will not preserve the current visual relationship between the house and former farmstead, notwithstanding the existing fencing between the two. We have visited site and made our own assessment of the potential visibility of the rear additions from the public realm, but it should be noted in any case that as this is a listed building private as well as public views will be significant.
- As identified in the Heritage Statement, the Stables building has been heavily modified over the years, including having been raised in height by 1881. Numerous alterations have subsequently been made to the building, including its pitched roof. The current eaves height is too low for practical use, with these proposals seeking to raise the roof in a similar manner to what has been carried out historically. This will provide a wall against which the proposed glazed link will sit. The internal space will become far more useable, compared to the current scenario where the building is not practical for any particular use;
 The raising of the stables roof remains contentious. I do not accept that a practical use for the space could not be found without this, even if that use remained as an ancillary

outbuilding to the farmhouse, rather than as part of the domestic accommodation. Historic alterations to the building, particularly those made whilst it formed part of the working farmstead may be in themselves of interest, and do not provide a justification for further alterations which would be damaging to the historic form and fabric of the building, its special interest and contribution to the setting of the farmhouse.

Although I have read the further response from the agent to this issue it does not change my opinion or the reasoning behind it as set out above. This work remains in my opinion contentious.

- In raising the roof, the junction between the existing and proposed brickwork will be demarcated with a brickwork detail TBC. The whole roof is constructed in mediocre softwood, was all built at the same time, and is nailed together rather than having and particularly interesting jointing. Lifting the roof to make the space more practical is simply a further evolution of the structure based on the present socio-economic climate, which underscores much of the reasoning for past changes to the property;

See above. The proposed brickwork detailing would not mitigate for the harm caused by these proposed works.

No further comment.

- As for the partitions within the Stables, these are not in a particularly good condition and further inhibit its practical use. It is therefore proposed that their former presence is demarcated in an alternative way, through the use of alternative floor finishes and the provision of nibs;

See previous comments, The loss of the stall partitions remains contentious- if their retention is not conducive to domestic accommodation, an alternative use for the building should be sought. Nibs and floor finishes would not compensate for the loss of these features.

I note the submitted response suggests that the partitions could in fact be retained, which would be a positive step, but we do not appear to have revised plans to show this.

- The annotation for a future link was part of a feasibility study that is not being proceeded with. The note on the plan was left on in error and is not part of the proposals;

Noted.

No further comment.

- We are grateful for your acknowledgement that the Garage building, viewed in isolation, is not problematic in itself. Owing to the changes proposed for the extension to the house, the overall bulk and massing of the overall scheme is much reduced. Coupled with the increase in transparency of the Kitchen extension to allow views through to the farmyard beyond, the Garage proposal remains very much commensurate with the scale of the property;

Please see above re. the proposed rear extension.

No further comment.

- The external landscaping works have been detailed to reduce the existing swathes of concrete surfacing that somewhat detract from the setting of the listed building. The raised planted beds to the west elevation help accommodate the level changes towards the Garaging, and would be formed in brick to match those found on the Stables. Subject to feedback on the above items, existing and proposed sections would be provided for the planters to help assess the changes in levels;

Please see previous comments.

No further comment.

- The bunded oil tank would sit above ground level, but at a lower level than the driveway to conceal it from view. It is currently sited adjacent to the house and is visually detrimental to its setting. Its proposed relocation is considered a significant visual enhancement. The sewage treatment plant will be buried below ground, as is standard for such installations. We note that the

Tree Officer has raised no objections to the proposals. Subject to feedback on the above items, existing and proposed sections will be provided for this area to illustrate the changes in levels.

Further detail would be needed to comment, as per previous comments.

The response document includes sectional drawings which show both the oil tank and sewage plant located to the north of the house and set down the slope, apparently concealed by a retaining wall around the area to the front of the new garage building. These elements of the proposal are not considered contentious subject to further detail.

In summary, notwithstanding the revisions suggested to the scale and form of the proposed rear link extension, and the further comments by the architect, the proposal remains in my opinion unacceptable in terms of its impact on the special interest of the listed farmhouse and curtilage listed stables, for the reasons set out above and in my previous comments. This will be contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. The works would result in less than substantial harm to the house and to the stables building, at around the mid-high range of that scale in both cases; in the absence of the revised HS and revised elevations it is difficult to be more precise about the level of harm caused.

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