

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 March 2026 11:18:40 UTC+00:00
To: "Anna Tidey" <anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: 11-14 Hett Close, Ardingly DM/25/3210

Hi Anna

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

Firstly, just on a small technical point I note the DoD has not been updated and continues to refer to uPVC.

The proposal has been revised to show replacement double glazed timber framed windows and composite timber ply faced doors. The DAS has also been revised to acknowledge that the building is within the Conservation Area. This is welcomed, subject to further, site specific detail which could be required by condition.

The proposal is therefore considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Ardingly Conservation Area, meeting the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35.

I would recommend the following condition:

- Detailed elevational and sectional drawings, at an appropriate large scale, annotated to show materials and finishes, of typical examples of new windows and doors. Your drawings should show glazing bar detail as appropriate.

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
Sent: 20 January 2026 16:25
To: Anna Tidey <anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: 11-14 Hett Close, Ardingly DM/25/3210

Hi Anna

Comments on the above planning application.

Firstly, I note that the submitted DAS comments that the site is not within a Conservation Area, which is incorrect and should be amended.

The application site is a small, modern apartment block located within the Ardingly Conservation Area. The block is part of a larger development also including ten houses which was granted planning permission in 1999, and which occupies part of the former grounds of Hapstead House, a large probably mid-19th century building, now converted to flats, which is located just to the south. Hapstead House is one of the oldest and certainly the largest buildings in this eastern part of the Conservation Area, and has some landmark value, being a focal point in views from the High Street along the original entrance driveway (now Hett Close). A small number of other historic buildings which were part of the Hapstead House estate also survive- the Lodge House adjacent to the High Street, and the former coach house to the north of the main building, now a residential conversion. These historic buildings have group value, and make individually and collectively a strong positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The late 20th century development of which 11-14 Hett Close is in close proximity to the historic house and coach house, and will have resulted in loss of part the original gardens. It is however relatively sympathetic in design and materials to the original buildings, which to an extent mitigates the harm to the setting of the historic buildings and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area arising from these factors. For example, timber has been used for the windows and doors to the building.

The current proposal is for the replacement of the existing timber windows with uPVC framed casements and the timber doors with composite units. In my opinion, the proposal is unacceptable in principle, as the use of these materials is not sympathetic to the Conservation Area or to the context of the adjacent historic buildings at Hapstead House and the former coach house. It would detract from the quality and consistency of the development at Hett Close, and from the contribution which this makes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. I would recommend that the proposal is amended to indicate replacement double glazed timber framed windows and doors of an appropriate design. In regards of the windows, any amended proposal should also omit the prominent trickle vents shown on the submitted proposed drawings.

As it stands, I would consider the proposal harmful to the character and appearance of the Ardingly Conservation Area, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35. In terms of the NPPF, I would consider the harm caused to be less than substantial, at the low-mid point of that scale, such that paragraph 215 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