

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 April 2025 15:47:57 UTC+01:00
To: "Katherine Williams" <Katherine.Williams@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Barlands, The Street, Warninglid DM/29/2943 and 2944

Hi Katherine

Comments on the above planning and listed building consent applications. My apologies for the delay in getting these to you, which has been caused by pressure of other work.

Barlands is a Grade II listed former farmhouse located in a rural position to the south west of Warninglid. The farmhouse is part of a historic farmstead which includes a small number of surviving former farm buildings to the east which from historic map regression appear to date from the 19th century or earlier and may (depending on their history of ownership and other criteria) be regarded as curtilage listed, as well as an ancillary building to the north (known as the stables) which from the submitted Heritage Statement dates from the 19th/early 20th centuries (being of a number of phases of work) and would certainly be regarded as curtilage listed, and a more modern garage building beyond this.

The submitted HS suggests that the core of the farmhouse is a small mid-16th century building with an open hall, overshoot cross passage and service rooms. The building appears to have been extended and substantially altered in a number of phases during the late 16th and 17th centuries, including the addition of a two storey plus attics extension to the eastern end, and the insertion of a substantial brick built chimneys stack, as well as the creation of a cellar. Further alterations were carried out in the late 17th and 18th centuries; during the 19th century further works took place including the underbuilding of the majority of ground floor external walls, new windows and tile hanging introduced to the rear, and internal alterations including a new stair and stair enclosure. The house was for some time during the 19th century divided into two cottages, but was reinstated as single dwelling during the 20th century.

The earliest fabric of the 'stables' building lies in the masonry base to its eastern end, which may represent the remains of an earlier building shown on the 1839 tithe map. The fabric above this is c. mid 19th century, and forms the eastern cell of the building. The western end of the building was rebuilt in more than one phase during the late 19th/early 20th century, and two small extensions made at either end of the building, which are thought to be WCs for each of the two cottages into which the house was then divided. Further alterations were made during the 20th century including infill of a previously open section to the southern elevation, addition of new windows, addition of a loft within the east end of the range, the installation of stall partitioning within the eastern end of the building, and refinishing of the floor in concrete. These alterations are thought to correspond with the reinstatement of the house as a single dwelling.

Based on the evidence within the historic building survey contained within the HS and our own site visits I would consider that the significance of the farmhouse to lie primarily in the following:

- The architectural evidential value of the survival of the fragmentary remains of the small building with open hall, over shot cross passage and at least one first floor chamber- as the HS notes this type of building was usually entirely rebuilt due to its modest scale, but is preserved here due to the particular nature of the successive building campaigns- as well as of the subsequent phases of its development, particularly the earlier work;
- The complex sequence of development of the house from that earliest phase to its current form, which has historical illustrative value in terms of the evolution of local socio-economic conditions and the domestic needs and aspirations of successive occupants;
- The construction and craftsmanship of the building's different phases, including the use of vernacular materials viewed within the landscape from which they were drawn;
- The relative lack of alteration to the footprint or immediate setting of the building from its appearance on 19th century maps with the exception of the addition of the new garage to the north; and
- The continuing relationship of the farmhouse and ancillary building to the north with the surviving historic farmstead buildings to the east, notwithstanding the intervening fencing and the new buildings which have been added to the farmstead.

The current proposal, which follows on from pre-application advice, is for internal and external works to the farmhouse and outbuildings to the north, including both the former stables directly to the north of the house and the modern garage building beyond this.

The proposed works include:

- Internal alterations to the listed farmhouse at ground floor;
- Removal of an existing rear porch and other alterations to the rear of the house;
- Construction of a substantial partly glazed extension to the rear of the house, linking the house to the former stables building;
- Alterations to the stables building both internally and externally including raising the height of the roof and alterations to the internal layout;
- Forming of a glazed link between the stables building and the proposed replacement garage (?);
- Demolition and rebuild of the modern garage building to provide a 1 ½ storey replacement building with garaging, and a study at ground floor and additional bedroom accommodation and storage above;
- Associated hard and soft landscaping and installation of a new sewage treatment plant.

To consider these works in turn:

- In respect of the internal alterations to the house at ground floor I would firstly note that these are not addressed in the submitted Heritage Statement- the Statement should be expanded to include commentary on these aspects of the scheme. The proposed new glazed panel/sliding door to the existing opening (no. 3 on the proposed ground floor plan key) appears to sit under a Phase 1 (mid 16th century) beam, which retains mortices and other evidence of earlier framing elements. Whilst (subject to discussion within an expanded HS) I would therefore consider that this aspect of the proposal may be acceptable in principle, great care would have to be taken in the design and location of the panel/door to ensure that it did not obscure or result in damage to fabric or features of interest. Further, more detailed information of this work should be provided, as we would wish to be assured that the principle of the work would be practical in terms of avoiding adverse impact on surrounding fabric. The proposed floor plan is also annotated at 5 to suggest a nib is to be cut back, but I am not clear from the drawing what is

referred to. The ground floor plan within the HS suggests that this part of the building was largely altered during the 19th century, however due to the proximity of Phase 1 fabric I would require more clarity as to the location and level of significance of the fabric affected by this work.

- The rear porch appears to be modern in date, and its removal is not considered contentious in principle. The infilling of the doorway itself however is in my opinion potentially contentious- I would be interested to understand the date of the aspect of the building's plan form. If it were to date, for example, as seems likely, from the subdivision during the 19th century of the house into two cottages I would suggest that the door should be retained and fixed shut, rather than infilled, as this would be illustrative of a fairly significant aspect of the house's narrative. Again, the HS should be expanded to address this.
- At pre-application stage the principle of a link extension between the house and stables was regarded a contentious, due to the distance between the two buildings. Concerns were also raised regarding the scale, form and design of the link, in the context of the existing house and its setting.

Although some modifications have been made to the proposal as currently before us, in my opinion it raises similar issues in terms of the principle of the proposal, and also the scale of the extension (which remains very substantial), its form and its detailed design. In my opinion, putting aside the difficulty with the principle of linking the two historic buildings, any significant addition to the rear of the existing house, which as noted above largely retains its historic footprint which has not been significantly added to or altered since the 17th century, remains contentious. Even were a significant extension to be regarded as acceptable in principle, the scale of the addition as shown would be regarded as excessive.

The scale, form and position of the addition continue to essentially sever the house and the outbuilding to the north from the remaining historic farmstead to the east. As the HS suggests, despite the intervening fencing there remains an appreciable relationship between the buildings which contributes positively to the setting and special interest of the farmhouse, and to the significance of the remaining elements of the historic farmstead. The high level windows shown to the eastern elevation of the extension will not be adequate mitigation for this.

I also consider that aspects of the detailed design of the proposed extension remain contentious, in particular the treatment of the eastern elevation which appears particularly unsympathetic to the context. Whilst I appreciate the reasoning behind the inclusion of the high level windows, they do not relate well to the form or proportions of the existing fenestration to the house, and do not do enough to prevent this elevation appearing stark and largely unrelieved, so that the house appears to 'turn its back' on the historic farmstead with which it was previously associated. This will be apparent in views from the direction of the farmstead and also likely from The Street, looking north east through the farmyard entrance, in which the house and farm buildings still appear as a group despite the intervening fence.

- At pre-application stage the principle of the conversion of the Stables building to ancillary accommodation was not considered contentious, however we had insufficient information to be able to comment meaningfully on some aspects of the detail of the works then proposed. The scheme has evolved since then, and now includes more invasive work, including in particular a significant increase to the roof height of the building, which would result in the complete loss of the existing roof structure. In my opinion, this aspect of the scheme is also contentious, in particular the loss of the historic fabric to the roof, the adverse impact on the existing, historic proportions of the building, which will have related directly to its use, and its relationship of scale with the house, the extent to which the southern elevation of this modestly scaled building

is obscured by the proposed infill extension, and the adverse impact on the internal plan form and features of the building including the loss of the stall partitions, which while dating from the 20th century speak strongly of the narrative of the building.

- The proposed ground floor plan is annotated to show the indicative position of a future link between the altered stables building and the proposed replacement garage. This however is not shown on the proposed elevations. As was noted at pre-application stage any link between the two buildings is likely in the context of this scheme overall not to be favourably viewed as this would have the effect of increasing the effective footprint of the additions to the house even further.
- The proposed replacement garage is not considered contentious in principle. The proposed new garage is quite significantly bigger than the existing, but I do not consider given the lower position of this building on the slope dropping away to the north of the house that this would be necessarily problematic in itself, viewed in isolation with the remainder of the proposals. As part of the current scheme, however, this increase in bulk does contribute to the overbearing scale of the proposed new work to the rear of the house.
- The associated hard and soft landscaping works immediately around the buildings are intimately associated with the proposed extension and other works discussed above, so that it is difficult to comment these in isolation. However, I would note that the significant expansion of hard surfacing in the area around the house which appears to be shown to its north may be regarded as contentious. We would also need to see existing and proposed sections to allow us to understand the extent and nature of any regrading involved with this work before I could comment fully, as well as full details of the proposed bunded oil tank and sewage treatment plant.

In summary, although some aspects of the proposal may be acceptable in principle, viewed in isolation, others are considered contentious in principle and/or their scale, form and detailed design. In other respects, further information would be required for fully informed comment.

As it stands, I would consider that the proposed rear link extension and the works to the stables building would result when viewed in isolation in less than substantial harm to the special interest of the building, at around the mid-high range of that scale. However, it is not possible to comment fully on the impact of the scheme as whole without the further information mentioned above. The proposal is also, as submitted, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34 (Listed buildings and other heritage assets), and the requirements of the Council's adopted Design Guide, specifically the design principles referring to domestic extensions.

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

The
Electoral
Commission



No ID? You can apply for free voter ID
Find out more at

electoralcommission.org.uk/voterID

or call 0800 328 0280