

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 August 2025 12:22:08 UTC+01:00
To: "Stefan Galyas" <Stefan.Galyas@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/25/0780 and 0781 Red House Farm, Cowfold Road, Bolney

Hi Stefan

Comments on the above planning and listed building consent applications. I note that we have received an addendum Heritage Statement, and I have read and considered this as part of my response to the proposal.

Red House Farm is a Grade II listed former farmhouse located in a rural position outside Bolney. The building dates from the 17th century and was apparently originally constructed as modest 3 bay hall house, the central bay open to the roof. The open hall was apparently floored during the 1700s, and the larger masonry chimney stack inserted at the centre of the building. This dating is taken from the original heritage statement submitted, but is an usually late date for this alteration locally. The original and addendum Heritage Statements collectively provide a brief timeline for the development of the building, and a more detailed analysis of fabric as existing, identifying early work and later alterations, although the survey drawings referenced are not included, and the sequence of construction and alteration of the building as set out in these documents is correspondingly somewhat difficult to follow.

Historical map regression shows an outshot to the centre of the rear of the building in place by the 19th century, which survives as an externally accessed store, and a further addition to the southern end of the rear elevation by c.1900. As existing, outshots to the rear and southern elevations are contained under a catslide roof wrapping around this corner of the building- the original heritage statement suggests that this is the result of 20th century alterations. This statement also suggests that the northern bay of the building was rebuilt during the 19th century. Further external and internal alterations took place during the 20th century.

Red House Farm is recorded in the West Sussex Historic Farmstead and Landscape Character assessment. Historic map regression suggests that the associated farm buildings were mostly grouped around the northern end of the pond which is located just to the west of the house, although there was a pigsty located directly to the north, no doubt in order make use of kitchen scraps. These buildings have now been lost, and there is an assemblage of more modern outbuildings to the west.

Planning permission and listed building consent were granted in 2022 for a single storey rear extension, with internal alterations to create a shower room at ground floor and bathroom at first floor.

The current proposal is for the construction of a two storey rear extension to the northern end of the building, with associated internal alterations at ground and first floor.

In my opinion, the proposed two storey rear extension is contentious in principle due to its impact on the characteristically modest scale of the building. Although it is set down in height from the main ridge of the house's roof, the addition remains substantial, in the context of the existing house, and in my opinion demonstrates an inappropriate relationship of scale with the

historic core of the building, particularly when viewed in conjunction with the existing additions to the rear and to the south. The extension also appears awkward and overbearing in its abutment to the existing adjacent outshots and catslide roof, and detracts from the contribution made to the house's narrative by the 19th century or earlier external store (albeit that this may have been altered during the 20th century), which would become part of the internal accommodation.

The proposed extension also entails some loss of fabric and features to the rear elevation of the northern bay of the house- two window openings altered and enlarged to make doorways, and one blocked up. The addendum Heritage Statement recently submitted suggests that there would be a possible survival of historic fabric at first floor level to the wall below the existing window opening- this would have required further investigation were the proposed extension considered otherwise acceptable. At ground floor the elevation appears to have been underbuilt during the 1950s and the works at this level are therefore not considered contentious.

In association with the conversion of the external store to internal accommodation (a larder), it is proposed to remove and block up the external doorway, and to create a new internal door to the side elevation, which would link into the proposed rear extension. The loss of the external door, in my opinion, further erodes the character and legibility of this originally 19th century or earlier addition to the building.

Also externally, a new soil vent pipe is proposed towards the front of the northern side elevation, to serve the new bathroom at first floor. This will be an unattractive, and relatively prominent addition of visual clutter to the exterior of the building, which will detract from its appearance, including in views of the front elevation. This aspect of the proposal is in my opinion contentious, and would require reconsideration. I note that this is also highlighted as an issue within the addendum Heritage Statement.

The proposed associated internal works affect mainly modern fabric, and in some instances reinstate elements of an earlier plan form, as is noted in the addendum Heritage Statement. At first floor, the subdivision of the northern bay to create a bathroom and reduced bedroom might in other circumstances be regarded as contentious, but here as the works also include the reinstatement of the original bay width by the relocation of the southern bedroom wall, and removal of partitioning within the central bay, the proposal is considered on balance acceptable. The internal works are therefore not in themselves considered on balance to be contentious. Further detail would be required by condition, were the application otherwise acceptable, regarding the detailing of the partitions and their relationship with adjacent/overlying historic fabric/timbers as appropriate.

The proposal also includes seemingly quite extensive repairs to the main roof of the house. Whilst this may not be considered contentious in principle, were the application more generally acceptable further, more specific information would be required in relation to the re-roofing works and also any associated repairs to the underlying historic roof structure, in terms of justification, method statements and drawings as appropriate to show the nature and extent of the works envisaged.

In summary, the proposal raises concerns in terms of the scale and form of the proposed extension, and of aspects of the associated works to the existing building. In my opinion, this results in less than substantial harm at around the mid point of that scale to the special interest of Red House Farm and how this is appreciated. This will be contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF 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>



No ID? You can apply for free voter ID
Find out more at
electoralcommission.org.uk/voterID
or call 0800 328 0280