

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 May 2025 15:06:27 UTC+01:00
To: "Anna Tidey" <anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/25/0272 and 0422 Bowling Alley Cottage

Hi Anna

Further comments on the above proposal following the receipt of revised plans.

For ease, I will repeat my previous comments, which raised a number of issues, below, and discuss the response to these issues as shown in the revised plans in red:

'To consider these proposals in turn:

- The proposed changes to the form and footprint of the link extension remove the approved projection into the garden to the south of the house, so that the building line will be similar to the existing. This is not considered contentious in principle, however the height of the replacement link has increased so that it now sits above rather than below the eaves of the annexe building and rises higher up the catslide roof to the rear of the original building. This is not considered acceptable due to the adverse impact on the subservience of the link to the cottage and annexe, as well as the fabric of the catslide, and should be reconsidered. Furthermore proposed changes to the elevation to introduce more solidity will add to the apparent bulk of the link as well as reducing the extent to which it allows a visual separation between the house and the bulk of the annexe. The use of aluminium framed windows in place of timber framed also does not relate well to the context. I would also suggest that this should be reconsidered.'*

The height of the bulk of the link remains as submitted, so that this aspect of the concerns has not been addressed, although the section attaching directly to the house has been lowered, so that the impact on the historic fabric of the catslide appears to now be as previously approved. Although the elevational treatment has been amended due to the inclusion of a lower, lead clad section adjacent to the house, the issue with relative solidity of the extension remains as previously raised. The proposed aluminium windows are also retained as part of the scheme. These issues therefore remain contentious.

- 'For similar reasons to those given above the proposed amendments to the external wall of the kitchen extension are in my opinion contentious. One of the reasons why this extension was considered acceptable in the context of the existing additions to the building was the lightweight and transparent treatment of this elevation, which reduced the apparent bulk of the addition and mitigated the manner in which it imposes on the existing courtyard space. I would therefore recommend that this aspect of the proposal is also reconsidered.'*

The courtyard facing elevations have also been amended but although the amount of glazing has been increased, the proposal still does not have the lightweight quality of the approved scheme, and the aluminium windows are retained. This aspect of the proposal also therefore remains contentious.

- 'The changes to the internal layout of the annexe are not considered contentious.*
- The proposed amendment to the southern elevation of the annexe to introduce a large aluminium framed window detracts from the appearance of the building. Although the annexe is relatively modern and is not of a particularly sympathetic design, the form and proportions and the framing material of the proposed window do not relate well to the existing building or the context, and would further detract from the appearance of the*

annexe and the contribution it makes to the setting of the cottage. Although I would not object to the French windows approved being replaced with a window, the scale, design, glazing pattern and framing material require reconsideration.'

The proposed window has been omitted in favour of French windows similar in design to the approval, which addresses this aspect of the previous comments. However, the French windows continue to be shown with aluminium frames, which remains contentious.

- 'The proposed amendments to the internal works to the main house comprise alterations to the floor plan in the area of the proposed shower room and laundry. These amendments would have no greater impact on the historic fabric or room plan than the approved scheme, and in would fact retain more of the existing layout. This aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious.'*

Although not consistently shown (in that they do not appear on the elevations), one of the proposed plans shows solar PV panels to the roof of the link extension and kitchen. This appears a fairly extensive installation which has the potential to be quite visually intrusive. We would require more information in order to be able to comment fully, including a more detailed layout to show the number and position of the panels, elevations and sections to show the panels in context, and further details such as a manufacturer's spec. to show the appearance, height and dimensions of the panels themselves.

It would be helpful to have confirmation from the applicant that this work does not form part of the application.

In summary, the revised proposal continues to raise concerns in terms of the amended design and materials of the extension and works to the existing rear annexe. As shown, the proposal would be harmful to the special interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policies DP34 and DP35. In terms of the NPPF, the harm caused in both cases would be less than substantial, such that the balancing exercise set out in 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>



From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 March 2025 14:23
To: Anna Tidey <anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/25/0272 and 0422 Bowling Alley Cottage

Hi Anna

Comments on the above applications.

These applications are for alterations to an approved scheme of alteration and extension to the property, which is a Grade II listed 17th century building located within the Horsted Keynes Conservation Area. The historic cottage has substantial extensions to the rear, comprising a c. mid 20th century outbuilding which was later joined to the house by a link extension, and then further extended by an infill kitchen addition between the two, leaving a small courtyard between the kitchen and house which is bounded by the link to one side and a historic external WC and boundary wall to the other.

Planning permission and listed building consent were granted in 2021 for the enlargement of the kitchen extension and partial replacement and enlargement of the existing link extension, internal renovations to the annexe building and a new dormer window, and internal alterations to the historic core of the existing cottage. These permissions have been partly implemented and are considered to be extant.

The currently proposed amendments to the approved scheme are as follows:

- Alterations to the form and footprint of the rebuilt link extension, to remove an approved projection to the southern side, with changes to the elevational treatment to introduce more solid wall over the approved glazing;
- Amendments to the construction of the external wall to the kitchen extension, facing onto the courtyard, from a glazed screen to a solid masonry construction;
- Changes to the approved layout of the annexe;
- Alteration to the southern elevation of the annexe to replace French windows to a large aluminium framed window; and
- Amendments to the approved internal layout of the Cottage.

To consider these proposals in turn:

- The proposed changes to the form and footprint of the link extension remove the approved projection into the garden to the south of the house, so that the building line

will be similar to the existing. This is not considered contentious in principle, however the height of the replacement link has increased so that it now sits above rather than below the eaves of the annexe building and rises higher up the catslide roof to the rear of the original building. This is not considered acceptable due to the adverse impact on the subservience of the link to the cottage and annexe, as well as the fabric of the catslide, and should be reconsidered. Furthermore proposed changes to the elevation to introduce more solidity will add to the apparent bulk of the link as well as reducing the extent to which it allows a visual separation between the house and the bulk of the annexe. The use of aluminium framed windows in place of timber framed also does not relate well to the context. I would also suggest that this should be reconsidered.

- For similar reasons to those given above the proposed amendments to the external wall of the kitchen extension are in my opinion contentious. One of the reasons why this extension was considered acceptable in the context of the existing additions to the building was the lightweight and transparent treatment of this elevation, which reduced the apparent bulk of the addition and mitigated the manner in which it imposes on the existing courtyard space. I would therefore recommend that this aspect of the proposal is also reconsidered.
- The changes to the internal layout of the annexe are not considered contentious.
- The proposed amendment to the southern elevation of the annexe to introduce a large aluminium framed window detracts from the appearance of the building. Although the annexe is relatively modern and is not of a particularly sympathetic design, the form and proportions and the framing material of the proposed window do not relate well to the existing building or the context, and would further detract from the appearance of the annexe and the contribution it makes to the setting of the cottage. Although I would not object to the French windows approved being replaced with a window, the scale, design, glazing pattern and framing material require reconsideration.
- The proposed amendments to the internal works to the main house comprise alterations to the floor plan in the area of the proposed shower room and laundry. These amendments would have no greater impact on the historic fabric or room plan than the approved scheme, and in would fact retain more of the existing layout. This aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious.

Although not consistently shown (in that they do not appear on the elevations), on of the proposed plans shows solar PV panels to the roof of the link extension and kitchen. This appears a fairly extensive installation which has the potential to be quite visually intrusive. We would require more information in order to be able to comment fully, including a more detailed layout to show the number and position of the panels, elevations and sections to show the panels in context, and further details such as a manufacturer's spec. to show the appearance, height and dimensions of the panels themselves.

In summary, although aspects of the proposal are not considered contentious in principle, several elements require reconsideration and/or further information.

As it stands the proposal would be considered detrimental to the special interest of the listed building and to the contribution which it makes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This would fail to meet the requirements of District Plan Policies DP34 and DP35. In terms of the NPPF, the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to each asset- it is not possible to be more exact without a better understanding of the solar PV installation which may (or may not) contribute to this harm.

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