

Design and Access, Planning and Heritage Statement

The Meadows, BN6 9UZ

1.00 Introduction:

1.01 The purpose of the application is to seek Planning Permission for minor works for the extension of an existing dwelling to create a relocated kitchen and additional bedroom. This is a reduced scheme following the application DM/24/1406, and subsequent appeal APP/D3830/D/24/3350721 by Mr A Price.

1.01 Please refer to Mr A Prices comments with regard to Little Park (Grade II listed)

“16. Taking these factors into account, I conclude that the proposed development would not compromise the setting of Little Park, rather it would have a neutral effect that would not determinably alter how the asset would be experienced and would not adversely affect the ability to appreciate the significance of the asset. Consequently, the setting of the listed building, and the contribution it makes to the significance of the assets, would be preserved. The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with the requirements of Section 66(1) of the Act and the relevant provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment. The proposed development would also accord with the relevant provisions of DP Policy DP34. This policy, in summary, seeks to protect heritage assets. “

18. I note the Council's reference to a condition on the original planning consent for the property, which removed permitted development rights. However, this does not mean that no development should take place here, as set out by a previous Inspector. Rather, any proposal must be submitted to the Council for consideration.

2.00 DESCRIPTION:

2.01 The site is located to the north-east corner of Hurstpierpoint. Access to the site is via Marchants Close. The application site area is 0.5ha. To the north-east of the site is land currently under residential development for some 140 new houses. To the south, is land forming Little Park, being a Grade II* Listed Building. Further south of Little Park, the area is characterised by built up residential areas. To the west of the site, is a large dilapidated Dutch Barn which has extant planning permission for a single dwelling. To the north of this Barn is a small single dwelling. Beyond these two buildings, is a small traditional farm courtyard of residential buildings. There is a large pond north of the courtyard building up to the access track into the application site.

3.00 SITE CHARACTERISTICS:

3.01 The boundaries of the application site to the south and east are defined by mature trees and hedgerow. This landscaping defines the character of the application site and surrounding area. These proposals do not include for any proposed physical alterations that will materially change the character of the surrounding site.

4.00 AMOUNT & SCALE:

4.01 The works are minor in nature. They are a result of the applicant's desire to improve the standard and quality of living within the dwelling. The scale of the extensions are detailed to remain subservient to the overall design of the existing dwelling.

5.00 DESIGN & APPEARANCE:

5.01 The proposals have been designed to preserve the style and character of the existing dwelling. The existing dwelling is a storey and a half in scale. The appearance of the building is traditional with horizontal timber boarding, plain roof tiling and dark aluminium framed windows and doors. The existing roof is a gable design with traditional gabled dormer windows and rooflights. All the extensions are proposed in a traditional style to match

the vernacular of the existing dwelling. There is no unacceptable overlooking of any neighbouring dwelling. The roof pitch of the additions matches the pitch of the existing dwelling.

5.02 The design is fully sympathetic to the host dwelling, with materials to match.

5.03 The site is well screened from surrounding vantage points, including the publicly accessible Hurst Meadows to the east and north. The additions would be viewed in the context of the existing dwelling and would not be harmful to the wider countryside or the setting of the Listed building to the west.

6.00 MATERIALS:

6.01 All new materials will match the existing fabric of the dwelling on the site.

7.00 ACCESS:

7.01 Given the nature of the proposals, the general access into & within the property is not affected. The property does benefit from wheelchair access given existing levels. Access will therefore remain as existing and will not be any worse than the current situation.

8.00 HERITAGE STATEMENT:

8.01 The application site forms part of a wider site that was granted planning permission for 3 dwellings (reference DM/21/2367 & DM/22/0204).

1. Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM). The site does not lie in proximity to a Scheduled Ancient Monument or its setting.

2. Archaeological Notification Areas (ANA) The site does not lie within a designated Archaeological Notification Area.

3. Conservation Area. The site does not lie within a designated Conservation Area. Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area is located to the south of the application site. There is no visual relationship between the Conservation Area and the application site due to existing built environment.

4. Historic Parks and Gardens. The proposals do not lie within a Registered Park or Garden of Special Historic Interest.

5. Listed Building. Whilst there are no Listed buildings on the immediate site, however the site is in relative proximity of 'Little Park', being a Grade II* Listed building (Little Park) some 100m to the west of the application site. Little Park contains a number of latter-day ancillary buildings that have been converted to a residential use, a swimming pool and a garage building. In granting planning permission for the existing dwelling, under planning references DM/21/2367 & DM/22/0204, it was concluded that the approved dwelling would preserve the setting of Little Park Listed Building.

The dwelling is not visually apparent to Little Park by nature of the built-out levels and landscape screening to all boundaries as noted strongly by 2 appeal inspectors.

8.01 Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/D/23/3330972 – PD rights

8.02 This Appeal sought to remove a restriction removing PD rights, so that additions could be built without separate planning permission. The decision letter stated;

12. I do, however, have considerable sympathy for the appellant's concerns that the Council will never allow any further development at the site. In this context, I have reviewed the planning history including reference to the previous appeal decision to allow a porch extension, which demonstrates that further additions to the dwelling have been approved at the site. In this regard, the development plan includes Policies DP12 and DP26 of the

MSLP and HurstC1 of the HNP that allow for well-designed development in the countryside. These policies continue to apply to the appeal site, which I hope reassures the appellant that any future additions to the property could, as a matter of principle, be considered favourably subject to a suitable design being achieved.

13. I have also had regard to the duty under Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) that requires special regard to be made to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting, which is relevant due to the appeal site being within the setting of the adjacent Grade II* listed 'little park' building. I observed on my site inspection that the appeal property was located some distance from the adjacent listed building and being on lower ground and with mature screening in between.

8.03 Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/D/23/3321453 – Porch submission

8.04 This appeal followed the Council's decision to refuse permission for a porch addition (slightly smaller than that shown within the current application). The Inspector commenting as follows:

7. Nor do I consider that on this large plot, as shown by the red line on Drawing No. SK-C-LP, the addition would 'negatively impact upon the rural character of this edge of village site' or 'fail to protect the character and beauty of the countryside area on the village boundary' as claimed in the report. Instead the porch would be correctly perceived as a minor domestic addition, with any perceived visual disadvantage arising from its forward projection from the main structure mitigated by a design and external materials wholly in keeping with the host dwelling.

9. However, this is a patently unsatisfactory arrangement for visitors to the property as is entering the dwelling via the kitchen. In contrast, the proposed porch is directly adjacent to the reception room; would have a hallway to accommodate visitors' outdoor clothes and shoes, and would provide WC facilities without the need to go through a bedroom.

10. Turning briefly to the second issue of the effect of the porch on the setting of the listed Little Park, it would appear from the grant of permission for The Meadows that the main building itself was not regarded as having that effect. For the proposed porch to be so harmful as to now have that impact is not credible either in terms national and local policy to safeguard designated heritage assets or indeed plain common sense.

11. My assessment to this effect was confirmed on my visit by observation of the significant distance between The Meadows and Little Park; the lower site level of the former, and the presence of substantial mature screening between the two buildings. The combination of these factors means that there is effectively no meaningful visual relationship between the buildings that could be reasonably said to result in this limited extension of The Meadows having a harmful effect on the setting of the Grade II* listed 'Little Park'

12. On both main issues my conclusion is that the appeal scheme would have no adverse effects as regards the rural character and appearance of the locality and the setting of the listed building. There would therefore be no harmful conflict with Policies DP12, DP26 & DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014- 2031 adopted 2018; Policy HurstC1 OF the Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2031 and Government policy in Sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021

8.04 Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/D/24/3350721 The Meadows, Little Park Farm, Marchants Close, Hurstpierpoint, West Sussex BN6 9UZ - by Mr A Price

16. Taking these factors into account, I conclude that the proposed development would not compromise the setting of Little Park, rather it would have a neutral effect that would not determinably alter how the asset would be experienced and would not adversely affect the ability to appreciate the significance of the asset. Consequently, the setting of the listed building, and the contribution it makes to the significance of the assets, would be preserved. The proposed development would therefore be in accordance with the requirements of Section 66(1) of the Act and the relevant provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance

the historic environment. The proposed development would also accord with the relevant provisions of DP Policy DP34. This policy, in summary, seeks to protect heritage assets.

18. I note the Council's reference to a condition on the original planning consent for the property, which removed permitted development rights. However, this does not mean that no development should take place here, as set out by a previous Inspector. Rather, any proposal must be submitted to the Council for consideration.

Visually, the extensions proposed are 'contained' within the existing scale and mass of the approved dwelling. They will therefore NOT be apparent from Little Park Listed Building, and therefore it is concluded that there will be no detrimental impact on the setting of the Listed Building.

9.00 SUMMARY:

9.01 Given the small-scale nature of the proposals, the character, appearance and setting of the Grade II* Listed Building, 'Little Park', will be preserved. The proposals demonstrate that the scale, mass, style & appearance of the new extension will not impact on the existing dwelling to any detrimental effect, nor will it impact on the immediate surroundings.

9.02 As set by the Appeal Inspectors above there would therefore be no harmful conflict with Policies DP12, DP26 & DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014- 2031 adopted 2018; Policy HurstC1 of the Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2031

9.03 Given the above, it is concluded this application should be supported.