

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 September 2025 16:01:47 UTC+01:00
To: "Andrew Horrell" <Andrew.Horrell@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: 22 High Street, HPP DM/25/1445

Hi Andrew

Further comments on the above application following the receipt of revised plans.

The application has been amended to show a rendered finish to the elevations of the replacement rear extension, as well as a revised roof form which is more sympathetic in its relationship to the retained adjacent rear wing. Although it appears the plans have yet to be updated, we have received an email from the applicant confirming that the door at first floor level to the balcony will be painted timber rather than uPVC as originally proposed.

Subject to detail, the revised proposal meets the concerns previously raised, and is considered on balance to preserve the setting of the listed building and the character and appearance of the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area. This meets the requirements of District Plan Policies DP34 and DP35 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

I would suggest the following conditions:

- Details of roofing and facing materials
- Detailed drawings, at an appropriate large scale, including sections, and annotated to show materials and finishes, of the following:
 - - typical examples of new windows and external doors
 - Rainwater goods and other external pipework to be of painted metal

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>



From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 August 2025 13:52
To: Andrew Horrell <Andrew.Horrell@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: 22 High Street, HPP DM/25/1445

Hi Andrew

Comments on the above planning application.

The application site is an unlisted end of terrace building dating from the 19th century, located to the south side of Hurstpierpoint High Street towards its western end. It is part of a small terrace of three similar buildings, which is attached at its western end to a further building of an apparently similar date but different design. The three terraced buildings are of two storeys, and originally had an L shaped plan with a small rear wing to one side, however all three appear to have been extended quite significantly to the rear. The terrace is located within the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area, and is also within the settings of 19-27 (odd) High Street, opposite, which are Grade II listed buildings dating from the early 19th century, and Holy Trinity Church, adjacent to the east, which is II* listed and dates from the mid 19th century. The churchyard to Holy Trinity extends eastwards to wrap around the rear boundary of the gardens behind the terrace. The rear of the terrace is visible from the churchyard, although the lower storeys are partly screened by the garden boundary wall.

22 High Street has been extended to the rear apparently by successive ground floor additions, one behind the other, attached to the original rear wing. The current proposal is to demolish the outermost of these extensions, which appears to be a relatively low-quality 20th century structure with timber cladding and a felt roof, and construction of a replacement extension on an enlarged footprint, with vertical timber cladding to the walls and a fibreglass roof.

As noted above, the application property has already been repeatedly extended, and in other circumstances the further enlargement of the additions to the rear of the building now proposed would be likely to be regarded as contentious. The Council's adopted Design Guide requires at Design Principle DG49 '*General Principles for Extensions*' that '*Extensions should... normally 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.*' However, in this instance the other two buildings in the terrace have larger additions to their rear, and the site is relatively well screened from external views, including views from the adjacent churchyard, by both these existing neighbouring extensions and by the surrounding boundary wall. Furthermore, the existing extension which it is proposed to replace is of a poor quality and its demolition and replacement therefore offers scope for an improvement to the appearance of the rear of the building, through improved materials and design- such improvements might stand to be balanced against the harm caused by the increased scale of the extension.

I would therefore suggest that the current proposal is amended to show a more sympathetic, higher quality facing material, rather than simply attempting to replicate the existing timber cladding. In the context of the existing house, the most appropriate choice would be painted render to match the treatment of the remainder of the rear wing and previous extension. It would also be preferable if the eaves parapet detailing to the adjacent existing extension which is to be retained was also employed across the new addition rather than juxtaposing a different roof form as proposed.

In terms of fenestration, I would recommend that at first floor notwithstanding the presence of uPVC elsewhere to the building the opportunity is taken to enhance this part of the building by replacing the existing doors with painted timber rather than more uPVC. Again, this enhancement could be weighed against the harm arising from the increased size of the ground floor extension. The French windows to the rear of this extension could be detailed as part of a condition on any permission granted- I would not necessarily object to the use of metal in this less prominent position, subject to such detail.

In summary, although the proposal may be considered on balance acceptable, this will be subject to amendments to some aspects of the scheme relating in particular to materials and detailing, to ensure that views overall the proposal notwithstanding the increased scale of the rear extension will preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the adjacent Church.

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