

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 September 2026 09:49:39 UTC+01:00
To: "Peter Davies" <Peter.Davies@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Oxford House, Cherry Lane, Bolney DM/26/1583

Hi Peter

Comments on the above planning application.

Oxford House is an unlisted, semi-detached house located to the western side of Cherry Lane, within the Bolney Conservation Area. The house is one of a semi-detached pair which date from the late 19th or early 20th century. The original symmetry of the pair remains apparent, although both buildings have been extended, with Oxford House having a two storey rear and single storey side additions, and its neighbour Cambridge House having a particularly unsympathetic full height 2 ½ storey addition to the rear. Notwithstanding this, the pair retain some character and make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. The extensive gardens in which the pair are set also contribute positively to the spacious and verdant character of this part of the Area (as noted in the Council's document '*Conservation Areas in Mid Sussex*'), in particular the deep front gardens.

The current proposal is for a single storey side extension to the house, and an extension to the rear of the existing garage, which is located to the front of the property adjacent to the road, with the addition of solar PV panels to the roof of the building. Associated changes to the hard landscaping are also shown.

To consider these works in turn:

- The proposed single storey side extension replaces an existing crown-roofed addition with a flat roofed structure on a significantly enlarged footprint. The new extension is both considerably wider, and set closer to the main façade of the building than the existing. In my opinion, the principle of an extension of this scale is contentious. This is particularly in the context of the existing rear addition to the building, as the cumulative impact would be that the extensions to the house will be overbearing in their relationship with the host building. This is both harmful to the site's contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and contrary to the requirements of the Council's adopted Design Guide at Design Principle DG49 '*General Principles for Extensions*', which requires that '*Extensions should... be designed to be well-integrated with the existing scale, form and massing allowing the original building to remain the dominant element of the property whether it has one or several additions.*'

Furthermore, the design of the extension, which is shown with an extensive flat roof, is not sympathetic to its context, and the relocation of the front door from its historic position on the façade of the original house to the extension would further detract from its appearance.

- I also have concerns with respect to the proposed garage extension. The existing double garage is a fairly substantial building, and not an attractive one. It detracts from the open and verdant character of the front garden to the building, and from the street scene of Cherry Lane. The proposed addition is significant in scale and would both further detract from the garden space, and render the building more prominent within the street scene.
- The adverse impact of these works will be exacerbated by the associated alterations to hard landscaping, in particular the extended hard standing to the frontage of the garage, which results in further loss of garden space.

For these reasons, I consider that the proposals will result in harm to the character and appearance of the Bolney Conservation Area. In terms of the NPPF, I would place that harm at the low-mid range of the scale sitting below that of substantial harm or total loss. Under paragraph HE6.4 of the new NPPF this harm stands to be weighed against the public benefits, if any, of the proposal.

In undertaking the balancing exercise set out by paragraph HE6.4, which is a matter for the Case Officer, it should be noted that the new NPPF requires that substantial weight should be given to an asset's conservation (HE6.1), and that any harm to a designated asset shall be of considerable importance and weight (HE6.3).

Policies HE4.1 and HE4.2 will also be relevant. HE4.1 requires that development proposals should avoid or minimise harm to the significance of heritage assets, and instead conserve this significance. HE4.2 requires that any harm to, or loss of significance of a heritage asset should have a clear and convincing justification. In my opinion the proposal fails to meet these tests.

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