

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 October 2026 15:10:30 UTC+01:00
To: "Hamish Evans" <Hamish.Evans@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/26/0624 Former Methodist Church Hall, Cuckfield Rd, HPP

Hi Hamish

Further comments on the above planning application. For ease, I have added these in red to the previous comments below, which raised a number of issues.

In summary several positive revisions have been made to the proposal, and on balance the treatment of the building is now considered acceptable. Although the landscaping has also moved forward, it is my opinion that more could be done to ameliorate the appearance of the frontage of the site, in particular in terms of the amount and nature of soft landscaping which is proposed, and the nature and height of the screening fencing/planting as shown (see below).

Subject to the above-mentioned further consideration of the landscaping, in my opinion the proposal now preserves the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, meeting the requirements of the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF and of District Plan Policy DP35.

If on balance you are now minded to approved the scheme, subject to the above landscaping revisions, I would recommend the following conditions:

- Details of roofing and facing materials, to include fascia boards if replaced.
- Detailed drawings, at an appropriate large scale, including sections, and annotated to show materials and finishes, of the following:
 - typical examples of new or replacement windows and external doors. Your drawings should as appropriate include details of glazing bars, leading and depth of reveal.
- Detailed hard and soft landscaping scheme, to include elevations of new or altered boundary treatments and means of enclosure within the site, and of hard landscaping materials.
- New brickwork to be to match existing adjacent work in colour, texture and bonding pattern and colour, texture and style of pointing.
- New rainwater goods and other external pipework or vents to be of painted metal.
- Rooflights to be flush fitting, metal framed conservation style rooflights.

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: 28 July 2026 16:03
To: Hamish Evans <Hamish.Evans@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/26/0624 Former Methodist Church Hall, Cuckfield Rd, HPP

Hi Hamish

Comments on the above technical details consent.

Permission in principle has been granted for the conversion of the former Methodist Church Hall, which is located within the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area, to 6 dwellings. The current application refers to the detail of the conversion, including external and internal alterations to the building.

As noted in my comments on the PiP application, the existing building although altered is considered to be of some interest and value within the street scene. In my opinion, the proposal as submitted raises a number of concerns in terms of the impact on the building and on the street scene of Cuckfield Road:

- The proposed work to the façade of the building does not do enough to preserve its existing ecclesiastical character. The alterations to the feature windows to the front facing gable require reconsideration in this light, and the palette of materials should also be revised to better reflect the local context. Timber cladding will not be acceptable in this location; the introduction of small areas of render or hung tile may be more appropriate, but as noted above more should be done to retain the existing feature glazing.

The proposal has been amended to show a greater part of the existing feature glazing retained, and the timber cladding replaced with fair faced brick and smaller areas of hung tile. The glazing to the gable is retained. While some of the vertical emphasis is lost, and the level of detailing is reduced, on balance this is considered acceptable subject to detail.

- The existing leaded glass windows to the older parts of the building should also be retained wherever possible. The introduction of numerous new French windows to the south side of the building is particularly problematic in this respect, and appears unjustified given that there is no garden space to speak of to this side of the building. What outside space is present would appear so confined as to be unusable?

The proposal has been amended to retain the leaded glass windows to the front range of the building. This is a welcome improvement on the original scheme, as the character of the older core of the building is better preserved. This aspect of the scheme is now considered acceptable, subject to detail.

- The number and scale of new rooflights to the southern roof slope are excessive and require reconsideration.

The number of rooflights to this side of the building has been significantly reduced, and the scale of the proposed new window nearest the site frontage also reduced. This is beneficial to the appearance of the scheme, and is considered acceptable subject to detail which can be reserved by condition.

- In general, the proposed introduction of new uPVC windows or doors will not be supported, and should be revised to show painted timber or possibly metal, depending on the context. uPVC is not a material which will be acceptable on a period building within a conservation area.

Reference to new uPVC windows/doors has been removed from the plans in favour of retention of the existing windows, or new metal framed windows and doors. This is welcomed subject to detail.

- No attempt appears to have been made to preserve or enhance the frontage of the site, which is shown as entirely given over to parking, with bike and bin stores in a prominent location partly forward of the frontage of the building- the existing areas of planting, which are already very limited, appear to be shown removed, and in general no consideration appears to have been given to appropriate soft landscaping. The existing planted areas should be retained and augmented with new soft landscaping, including if possible trees, and the scale and placement of bike and bin stores considered so as to minimise their visual impact. I would like to see this information now, to be assured that an appropriate treatment can sit alongside the scheme as a whole; further details of materials and of the treatment of the side and rear garden areas could be reserved by condition.

The proposed layout towards the frontage of the site has been revised to set the bike and bin stores further back and introduce screening by planting. Whilst this is welcomed in principle, I consider that further amendments are required:

- the amount of proposed new soft planting remains minimal, and I would suggest that more should be done in this respect to the sides and possibly along the front boundary of the site.

- The proposed fencing/gate to either side of the chapel building appears to be of standard close boarded fencing/gate design, which has a domestic, suburban character which is not entirely in keeping with the nature of the site or the village Conservation Area context. Also, no permanent screening is shown to the north of the chapel in front of the bike store, so that the bike store remains potentially open to view, in particular as the planting is also shown as lower than the store. These aspects of the proposal (i.e. the nature and/or height of the fencing and of the planting) should be reconsidered to ensure that the bike store is fully hidden and the quality and appearance of the landscaping is commensurate with the age and character of the building.

Again, I would recommend that these amendments are required now rather than by condition, if possible.

In summary, the proposal requires amendment to ensure that the character and appearance of the building and site, and of the wider Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area, are proposed.

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

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>

Sent: 02 June 2025 15:49

To: Hamish Evans <Hamish.Evans@midsussex.gov.uk>

Subject: DM/25/0958 Former Methodist Church Hall, Cuckfield Rd, HPP

Hi Hamish

Comments on the above application for permission in principle.

The proposed development site is the former Methodist Church Hall located to the eastern side of Cuckfield Road within the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area. The current proposal is for the development of up to 6 dwellings on the site across a floorspace of up to 1000 square metres.

Due in part to the relative isolation of the area prior to the development of improved road, and later rail, transport during the 18th and 19th centuries, Sussex has a long tradition of non-conformist religion, which is witnessed by the survival of chapel buildings belonging to various denominations in many local settlements, including several within Hurstpierpoint. The significance of these buildings within the village, both in terms of its history and street scene, is noted within the adopted Conservation Area Character Appraisal at p. 11 '*Nonconformist Hurstpierpoint*'.

[Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area Appraisal](#)

The Chapel in question was only quite recently included within the Conservation Area, when the boundary was reviewed and several extensions made in 2018. The adopted appraisal justifies the relevant extension northwards along Cuckfield Road as follows:

'St Christopher's house is dated 1898 and has four spectacular stacks of ornate brick chimneypots as well as decorative hopper heads to the downpipes. This is followed by several attractive Victorian and Edwardian houses with strong architecture, then the Methodist church. The Victorian and Edwardian houses retain many original features such as Palladian window surrounds.

The boundary of the Conservation Area on Cuckfield Road at present excludes this historic cluster of buildings including the old bakery and Methodist Chapel, as well as a mix of Victorian and Edwardian properties including St Christopher's which are attractive and characterful, and retain many original features. Most front gardens are planted with hedges and trees which soften the street scene.

The long straight road is the main northern approach to Hurstpierpoint, and looking south allows glimpses of the landmark church steeple in the distance. It is a key gateway into the village centre, and is lined by attractive and characterful buildings. A boundary adjustment would help safeguard the special character of this part of the village.'

Historical map regression suggests that the Chapel dates from the early 20th century, and retains some of its original features, although it has a later extension to the front. It is a prominent building in the street scene, and is of some character, making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. It is worth noting that the revised boundary extends specifically to include the church at its northernmost point, which is a recognition of the value of the building in this respect. The building is also a historical focus of the local community, which is recognised in its previous designation as an asset of communal value. The Chapel closed in 2023.

In this context, there would be in an in principle objection to the loss of the existing building in terms of adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. However, it is noted that the submitted planning statements suggests that the new dwellings would *'likely be provided through the conversion of the existing buildings on the site'*. I also note that this statement suggests that matters of heritage and design will not be considered by the applicant at this stage, but will be reserved for a possible further technical details consent application - I am assuming that as I have been consulted on the current application these matters can in fact to some extent at least be taken into consideration as part of the current proposal.

In my opinion, the proposal raises a number of potential concerns in terms of the impact on the Conservation Area:

- The proposed change of use of the building would result in the loss of a community facility (specifically the church hall) which is clearly valued by local residents, and has been a focus of local activity for worship and other purposes for over 100 years. Notwithstanding the applicant's point that the immediately surrounding area is largely residential in nature, the loss of this facility will have an adverse impact on the vitality of the area, which will detract from its character.
- The applicant appears unwilling to commit themselves as to whether the existing building would be retained as part of the detailed proposals. The loss of the existing building would be damaging to the character and appearance of the street scene and of the Conservation Area, for the reasons set out above.
- Based on the very limited information in front of us regarding the floor plan of the existing building, I find it difficult to envisage how the chapel could be converted to create up to 6 new residential units without adverse impact to its external appearance. The existing spaces within the building, including the large volume of the church hall, and the existing elevational treatment including the sweeping roofs and the disposition of the fenestration (which appears to be almost entirely at ground floor, with the exception of the front facing gable), do not appear conducive to this intensive a use without extensive alterations, including to the exterior. Such extensive alterations are likely to detract from the character and appearance of the building and its contribution to the Conservation Area.

For these reasons it is my opinion that the current proposal, based on the limited detail in front of us, raises significant concerns in terms of the potential impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, both in terms of the change of use in itself, the potential (which is not ruled out by the applicant) for the loss of the existing building, and of the proposed intensity of that use, and likely associated impact on the appearance of the existing building if retained. This will be contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35 which states that: *'Development in a conservation area will be required to conserve or enhance its special character, appearance and the range of activities which contribute to it.'* In terms of the NPPF it is difficult to assign a level of harm without a fully detailed proposal, but I would expect this to fall within the less than substantial range, such that paragraph 215 will apply.

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