

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 June 2025 11:53:56 UTC+01:00
To: "Andrew Horrell" <Andrew.Horrell@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/25/1079 and 1141 Burtenshaws, Church Platt, Cuckfield

Hi Andrew

Comments on the above planning applications.

Burtenshaws is an unlisted, attached house located within the Cuckfield Conservation Area, in a relatively prominent position adjacent to one of the main roads leading into the centre of the village. The house, which appears to date from the 1970s, is not of any particular architectural interest, but is broadly sympathetic to the more historic buildings which surround it in terms of its form and materials. It makes a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The rear of the house is also open to public view from Church Platt, which forms the western approach to Grade I listed Holy Trinity Church, and its associated Grade II listed lych gates and tombstones. The house is also within the setting of the group of Grade II listed buildings which are located to the north along South Street, including Chantry Cottage and the White Hart Inn. The house makes a neutral contribution to the settings of these buildings.

We currently have two planning applications before us:

DM/25/1079: Replace existing wooden windows with like-for-like uPVC windows

The existing windows are timber, multipane casements, which are in keeping with the broadly traditional 'cottage' style aesthetic of the building, and with the traditional materials found throughout the Conservation Area. The Council's adopted character appraisal for the Area notes the importance of these materials to its character. Further, as part of the Management Proposals contained within the document, it states that the Council should seek to: *'Prevent the replacement of timber windows with UPVC windows and the construction of UPVC conservatories in the conservation area.'*

In my opinion, the current proposal to replace the existing timber windows to the house with uPVC units is unacceptable in principle, due to the impact on the character and appearance of the building and the wider Conservation Area. Notwithstanding its relatively recent date of construction, the house, as noted above, is relatively sympathetic to its historic context- one key reason for this is the use of appropriate, traditional materials. uPVC is not a traditional material, and is not one which we would support the use of in a sensitive historic setting such as this.

The proposal is therefore considered to detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and the settings of the nearby listed buildings mentioned above, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policies DP34 and DP35. In terms of the NPPF the proposal would result in both cases in less than substantial harm, such that the balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 will apply, bearing in mind the great weight that should be given to the conservation of the heritage assets under the requirements of paragraph 212.

I would recommend that the applicant consider instead replacing the existing windows with new double glazed timber framed windows.

DM/25/1141- Proposed uPVC covering to existing soffit, fascia, bargeboards and cladding to ground floor and first floor rooflines, and replace old gutters and gutter downpipes with new, like-for-like

This application proposes covering the existing painted timber soffit, fascia and bargeboards to the eaves of the house with uPVC, and replacing the existing gutters and downpipes like-for-like. As noted with the above application, the use of uPVC within the Cuckfield Conservation Area will not generally be considered appropriate. For similar reasons as given above, the use of this material to the eaves detailing of Burtenshaws is not in my opinion acceptable. I would recommend that painted timber is used as an alternative.

The proposed replacement guttering and downpipes are on a like-for-like basis, and are not considered contentious.

As it stands, the proposal is considered harmful to the character and appearance of the house and the wider Conservation Area and to the settings of the adjacent listed buildings, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policies DP34 and DP35. In terms of the NPPF the harm caused would be less than substantial, 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