

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 January 2025 11:34:03 UTC+00:00
To: "Caroline Grist" <Caroline.Grist@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/24/2953 and DM/24/2954 Lywood Barn, Lindfield Rd, Ardingly

Hi Caroline

Initial comments on the above planning applications.

Lywood Barn is a moderately sized former barn building, now converted to residential use, which forms part of the historic farmstead of Great Lywood, located in a rural position to the north of Lindfield. The farmstead also includes Great Lywood Farmhouse, which is a Grade II listed 16th century timber framed building just to the north of the application site, and Great Lywood Barn, which is just to the west, as well as other surviving historic ancillary farm buildings. The farmstead is recorded in the West Sussex Historic Farmstead and Landscape Character Assessment as a historic farmstead of the Medieval period.

Lywood Barn has group value with Great Lywood Farmhouse, and with the other surviving historic buildings within the farmstead. It contributes positively to the setting of the Farmhouse, and the manner in which its special interest as part of a historic farmstead is appreciated.

DM/24/2953

Firstly I note that we have not received a listed building consent in parallel with the current planning application, which is for alterations and a porch extension to the barn, and that the submitted Design Report states that the building is not listed. However, although not included on the Statutory List in its own right, when the building was converted during the 1990s, it was regarded as being within the curtilage of Great Lywood Farmhouse, and hence to be curtilage listed. The conversion required both planning and listed building consents, which were granted in 1994. On this basis, it is my opinion that there are good grounds for considering that the barn should continue to be regarded as curtilage listed, and that the current proposal would therefore require listed building consent as well as planning permission.

The relevant Historic England guidance, '*Listed Buildings and Curtilage*' was published in 2018, and therefore postdates the above permissions. However, at face value it would seem to me that Lywood Barn would continue to meet the relevant criteria for curtilage listing:

- It predates 1948 in its construction;
- It is in close proximity to Great Lywood Farmhouse, and formed part of the same historic farmstead, its position relative to the house and other former farm buildings presumably originally deliberately decided according to its role within the functional grouping;
- It would appear to have been in the same ownership both historically and at the date of listing (1957), as historical map regression seems to show that the farm continued to function during this period; and
- It was part of the same functional whole (Great Lywood Farm) both historically and at the date of listing.

I would therefore suggest that unless the applicant wishes to provide evidence to the contrary, the barn would be regarded as curtilage listed, and an application for listed building consent for the current works should be submitted.

In light of this, the current proposal which includes both internal and external works should be accompanied by an appropriately detailed Heritage Statement, which should ideally be based on a historic building survey carried out by an appropriately qualified and experienced historic building archaeologist.* The Statement should include a historic building impact assessment, and should also include a consideration of the impact of the proposals on the setting of Great Lywood Farmhouse, based on the staged approach set out in the relevant Historic England guidance GPA Note 3 'The Setting of Heritage Assets'. (Its worth noting that a Heritage Statement covering the last point would be a validation requirement for the planning application received in any case, regardless of the need for LBC, due to its location within the setting of the farmhouse.)

During our site visit yesterday, we considered the external alterations forming part of the application for planning permission, and I will comment on these below, however I note that the proposal also includes internal works which would also require listed building consent. Once we have received the above mentioned application for LBC, and the Heritage Statement, which should also cover these internal works, I will need to revisit the site to look at the interior of the building and assess these works.

The proposed external works to the barn comprise alterations to the south and west elevations of the building:

- Construction of a corten framed glazed entrance porch over the existing main entrance to the south elevation;
- Enlargement of a number of windows to this elevation;
- Enlargement of three existing rooflights to the southern roofslope and insertion of two new rooflights;
- Addition of a stove flue pipe to this roofslope;
- Creation of a new door to the western elevation; and
- Installation of an ASHP adjacent to the western elevation.

In respect of the existing elevations provided I note a couple of discrepancies- the plinth to the western elevation is annotated as red brick when in fact it is sandstone, the existing bin store to this elevation is not shown, and the plinth to the southern elevation is also at least partly stone.

I also note on the submitted existing and proposed elevation that there seems to be a difference in the way in which the roof tiles are depicted. Can the applicant please confirm if this is just an accidental difference in drafting, or whether a change of roof material is proposed? In addition, the cladding the elevations of the building is noted as charred timber. A existing, this is in fact painted or stained timber. Again, can the applicant please confirm whether there is any intention to change the cladding to the building?

To consider the proposed works listed above:

- The proposed entrance porch sits over the principle doors to the south elevation which would appear likely to be in the position of the original cart doors to this side of the building, opposite the retained cart doors to the north elevation, as is typical in barns of this type. Although it is difficult to comment definitively on this aspect of the proposal in the absence of the above mentioned historic building survey and heritage statement, in my opinion the principle of enclosing this opening behind a porch is likely to prove contentious, partly due to the impact on the footprint of the building and the legibility of its original form, but also because the proposed drawings appear to indicate an increase

in the size of the opening with associated loss of fabric. This aspect of the proposal therefore requires further information and/or reconsideration.

- The existing north elevation has a number of windows which are of a relatively domestic appearance. The proposed enlarged windows would increase their adverse, domesticating impact, and would also potentially result in a loss of historic fabric. This aspect of the proposal is considered contentious, and should be omitted.
- There are already a number of rooflights to the southern roofslope of the building. In my opinion, additional, or enlarged rooflights will detract from the surviving original character of the building – as is noted in the relevant Historic England guidance *‘Adapting traditional farm buildings- Best practice guidance for adaptive reuse’*: *‘One of the most sensitive issues with any farm building adaptation is the insertion of roof lights. Farm buildings rarely had any form of glazing at roof level, though sometimes glazed tiles or slates were used. Numerous new roof lights poorly positioned can have an intrusive impact, particularly where the roof is the dominant characteristic and is steeply pitched.’* In addition, subject to confirmation on the basis of an appropriately detailed historic building assessment, this aspect of the proposal may result in loss of historic fabric from the roof structure of the building.
- The proposed new stove flue pipe to the southern roofslope will add an element of clutter at roof level, but is a fairly minor alteration, and is likely in my opinion to be regarded as acceptable, subject to detail. This aspect of the proposal will affect the appearance of the building from the north, and should be added to the proposed north elevation.
- The proposed new door to the western elevation will result in a loss of fabric which may, subject to the findings of the above mentioned historic building survey and impact assessment be regarded as harmful. The stone plinth to this elevation is particularly characterful, and its partial loss would be potentially regrettable. More information is required to allow a fully informed assessment of this aspect of the proposal.
- The proposed ASHP would replace (it is assumed) the existing bin store (although this requires confirmation). Subject to further details, including of any associated impact on historic fabric arising from new pipework etc, and of an appropriate screening enclosure, this aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious in heritage terms.

In summary, although further information is required to allow a fully informed consideration of all aspects of the proposal, several aspects of the proposal are on the basis of the information in front of us considered harmful to the special interest of the curtilage listed building, and to detract from the positive contribution which it makes to the setting of Great Lywood Farmhouse, to the detriment also of this building’s special interest and the manner in which it is appreciated. This will be contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. In terms of the NPPF, although it is not possible to assign a more precise level of harm at present, I would consider it likely that in both cases the harm caused will be considered to be less than substantial, such that the balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 will apply.

*Although we are not able to give recommendations, I can if helpful provide contact details for companies which I know to be working in Mid Sussex which provide this service.

DM/23/2954

This separate planning application relates to a detached garage building within the gardens to Lywood Barn. The proposed works include demolition of an existing conservatory extension to the southern end of the building and construction of a replacement extension, a replacement

door to the side (west) elevation, and a new door to this elevation. A raised terrace to the south side of the building is also proposed.

Firstly I would note that again we do not have a heritage statement with this application. This will be validation requirement as the building is within the settings of both Great Lywood Farmhouse and of curtilage listed Lywood Barn. Also, there is again a discrepancy on the submitted elevations in terms of the cladding to the elevations, which is not charred timber, but painted or stained. It would be helpful if the applicant could confirm whether there is any intention to change the cladding to the building.

The existing garage building appears to date from the mid 20th century, and is unlikely to be regarded as curtilage listed, although this should be addressed in more detail within the required heritage statement, as historic map regression shows that the building, or one in the same position, was in place when Great Lywood remained a functioning farm, and the date of construction is not established as post 1948.

The existing conservatory is not of any particular architectural quality, and its demolition is therefore not considered contentious. The replacement structure is in a flat-roofed contemporary style, which given the existing standard domestic conservatory design is not considered unacceptable in principle. However I do consider that the proposed facing material (grey render) is not appropriate- I understand the applicant's rationale in terms of a material of an 'industrial' character, but a flat roofed 'concrete' structure would not be sympathetic to the rural/agricultural context or the more traditional buildings already present. This aspect of the proposal requires reconsideration.

The proposal new and altered openings to the building also require some reconsideration to ensure that the 'agricultural' character of the existing building is preserved:

- Although the new and altered glazed door openings to the side elevation may be acceptable in principle, I would suggest external timber doors are retained/included- these could be fixed open if preferred.
- The scale and form of the proposed new window opening above the replacement extension require reconsideration to reflect the character of the building- a smaller opening with vertical proportions may be considered more appropriate.

The proposed terrace to the south of the building is not considered contentious in principle, but the grey stone cladding should be amended to a material more sympathetic to the vernacular materials within the context- sandstone as is present in the adjacent buildings and walling would be more appropriate.

In summary, further information and amendments are required in respect of this application in order to ensure that the settings of the adjacent listed and curtilage listed buildings are preserved, and to provide certainty that the application building would not also be regarded as curtilage listed.

Kind regards,

Emily Wade

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



No ID? You can apply for free voter ID
Find out more at

electoralcommission.org.uk/voterID

or call 0800 328 0280