

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 June 2025 15:40:47 UTC+01:00
To: "Anna Tidey" <anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/25/0784 and 0785 The Meadows, Little Park Farm HPP

Hi Anna

Comments on the above planning applications, which are for two different schemes at the same site.

'The Meadows' is part of a recently approved development to the north east of Little Park Farm, a Grade II* listed former farmhouse, part of a historic farmstead on the northern edge of Hurstpierpoint. The house as approved is a 1 ½ storey L shaped building with broadly 'agricultural' aesthetic. The form and design of the building, which replaced a static home on the site, as well as the associated hard and soft landscaping, were intended to respect the historic agricultural use of the site, and the rural character of the wider context, in order to preserve the contribution made by the site to the setting of Little Park house.

The site has a complex planning history, including a series of appeals. However, we noted during our recent site visit that the conditions of the site and in particular the boundary with the gardens to Little Park appear to have changed subsequent to the most recent appeal (for a porch extension, which was allowed), in that the boundary now appears more open, with clear intervisibility between the site and the grounds of the listed building. Standing to the southern side of the site, we also noted that windows to the listed house itself were clearly visible. For this reason, and due to the differing nature of the current proposals to that most recent appeal, the weight which can be attached to that decision in terms of the current applications is considered to be limited.

DM/25/0784- Proposed fencing

Firstly, as we noted on site this application would appear to be retrospective, although the fencing which is in place, although clearly recently installed, does not entirely correspond to the fencing as shown on the submitted plan. The application is not accompanied by a planning statement which could elucidate the applicant's intentions and therefore it is difficult to understand whether it is intended to retain the existing, unauthorised fencing, so that the plan submitted is inaccurate, or to revise the fencing to reflect the application drawings. It would be helpful if this could be clarified. I also note that we do not have a heritage statement, which would be a validation requirement.

The fencing as installed, assuming that the intention is to retain this, raises a number of concerns in terms of the impact on the character of the development and the contribution it makes to the setting of Little Park. The inclusion of close boarded fencing, and of the 4 and 5 foot 'post and rail' fencing (which is not in fact post and rail in the traditional sense), has a suburbanising impact which detracts from the intended 'agricultural' aesthetic, and is not appropriate for the semi-rural context. These aspects of the proposal detract from the contribution which the site makes to the setting of Little Park, including in terms of views and vistas from the north eastern side of the grounds to the listed building, which will include both the listed building and the site. The close boarded fencing runs right up to the boundary and would be relatively prominent in these views.

The fencing as per the submitted plan, although not as above reflective of the situation on site, raises similar concerns.

It will be necessary to establish the intentions of the applicant prior to submission of further comments, but both of the above scenarios result in harm, through impact on setting, to the special interest of Little Park. This will be contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. In terms of the NPPF, the harm caused is less than substantial, at the lower end of that scale.

DM/25/0785- Proposed two storey extension on southern side elevation with gabled roof including two gabled dormers, a rooflight and a Juliette balcony. Addition of new gabled dormer on existing east facing roof slope to replace two rooflights, to serve an existing first floor bedroom.

Again, I note that we have not received a heritage statement with this application, which would be a validation requirement.

In my opinion, as stated in relation to previous applications, any further significant addition to the footprint or bulk of The Meadows will be unacceptable in principle, due to the adverse impact of the increased scale of the development on the openness, verdancy, and 'rural' nature of this part of the setting of Little Park and its associated historic farmstead, and the positive contribution which this makes to the special interest of the heritage assets and how this is appreciated. The current proposal is for additions of a significantly greater scale and bulk than the porch addition approved at appeal, and is located to the southern side of the building, closest to the boundary with Little Park.

For this reason the proposal is in my opinion harmful to the wider setting of Little Park, including the views and vistas mentioned above from within the gardens of the listed building. This will be contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. In terms of the NPPF, the harm caused will be less than substantial and at the lower end of that scale.

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