

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 August 2026 16:15:45 UTC+01:00
To: "Caroline Grist" <Caroline.Grist@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/25/2644 and 2645 Wykehurst House

Hi Caroline

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

The form and design of both the oil tank and ASHP/boiler enclosures have been amended in response to previous concerns, to reduce the visual impact of the installations and to relate the necessary screening structures more sympathetically to the context. In my opinion, bearing in mind my previous comments regarding the location of these installations, the proposal now meets the requirements of NPPF paragraph HE4.1 to avoid or minimise harm. Subject to detail, these aspects of the proposal are now considered on balance acceptable.

I note that the proposed Block Plan and Garden Wall Plan show the proposed pool house which is part of a separate application (and has received objections from both ourselves and Historic England). Although I understand the intention is to give a holistic impression of the works, this is misleading in the circumstances, and should be removed from the plans.

In summary, the proposal is considered on balance to meet the requirements of the NPPF (HE6.4) such that the level of harm arising through impact on setting to the significance of Wykehurst House is in my opinion potentially outweighed (subject to the Case Officer's agreement) by the public benefits arising from providing a sustainable method of heating the house, allowing its long-term beneficial use, and by in part enabling the use of energy efficient low carbon heating measures. The heritage benefit arising from the works of repair to the listed garden and forecourt walls is also noted. Furthermore, the amended scheme also in my opinion meets the requirements of HE4.1 in minimising the level of harm arising.

If you are minded to approve on this basis, I would recommend the following conditions:

- A detailed specification of works and methodology for the repairs to the forecourt and garden walls, to include details of materials to be used.
- A condition should be imposed to ensure that this repair work is undertaken in a timely fashion.
- Details of materials and finishes to the plant enclosures, and to the boiler flue.
- Detailed hard and soft landscaping scheme, to include details of materials.
- Where trenching works are required for service runs, the overlying surfacing shall be made good to match existing.

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: 29 April 2026 11:16
To: Caroline Grist <Caroline.Grist@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/25/2644 and 2645 Wykehurst House

Hi Caroline

Further comments on the applications following the receipt of draft revised plans.

In respect of the plant area, this has now been split so that the oil tank is shown to the south of the western driveway, and the ASHP and boiler enclosure to the north. The secondary gates have also been revised in terms of their position, to allow for this amendment, and to remove the solid screening which was previously attached to their inner side.

I remain concerned regarding the principle of locating the plant adjacent to the western drive and now, in the case of the ASHP and boiler enclosure, forward of the façade of the house. However, I do now also accept that the applicant has considered alternative positions and that the locations shown may represent the 'least worst' scenario. I am also aware of the requirements of the NPPF to give significant weight to works which will enhance the energy efficiency of domestic properties (although this of course

applies to the ASHP only), and I am mindful of the heritage benefits of other aspects of the scheme, namely the restoration of the walls to the forecourt and side garden area. On balance, and subject to support from Historic England, I would not now object to the principle of the proposal, in terms of the scale and location of the plant.

I do however consider that the proposed screening is in both cases (to the oil tank and to the ASHP and boiler) not appropriate in its form or design. I agree that robust screening is required, however in my opinion the planted trellises shown will appear as incongruous additions to the landscape. I did note the point made by the agent during our site meeting that he regards them as structures similar to follies which would add an element of visual interest or surprise, however in my opinion it will be much preferable to try to conceal or blend in the structures to the existing grounds as far as is possible, rather than making any kind of feature of them. This element of the proposal requires reconsideration, and a more contextual, naturalistic, but equally robust, approach adopted. For example, is their scope for a combination of building up of ground levels, with dense planting, around either or both areas?

The 5m high boiler flue to the boiler building is also a concern. We do not appear to have elevation showing the entirety of this feature, to scale? Can this be provided? Does it have to be this high? Why is it positioned to the elevation closest to the house, could it not be resited to the opposite end of the boiler building? What material and finish is it?

In summary, although the proposal is moving forward, further consideration of some detailed aspects of the scheme is required to ensure that the plant installations will not be unduly harmful to the setting and special interest of Wykehurst House.


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: 13 February 2026 15:35
To: Caroline Grist <Caroline.Grist@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/25/2644 and 2645 Wykehurst House

Hi Caroline

Further comments on the above applications.

Firstly, I note the comments in the covering note from Mr Stickland that his client is hopeful of buying the driveway which approaches the house from the east via London Road. This is suggested to reinstate the historic primary access to the listed building, which in principle would be welcomed. However, as the purchase does not seem to be finalised, and as the existing arrangement is admitted to be casual, the weight that can be attached to this in terms of the consideration of the current proposal must be limited. At present, the closest and apparently most heavily used access to Wykehurst is from the west via Colwood Lane, and the works affecting this access must be considered in that light. Also, I would consider it likely that the driveway from Colwood Lane will continue to be used on a regular basis even if the eastern access is reinstated, for practical reasons, bearing in mind the relative length of the two approaches.

The revised plans received continue to indicate repairs to the walls around the northern front courtyard and western terrace to the house. The applicant has indicated that a condition relating to the detail of these works would be accepted, and I am content that further information as to the nature of the repairs could be submitted in this manner.

With respect to the works to the historic gateway to the western side of the front courtyard, these have now been withdrawn from the scheme. This is somewhat regrettable, as it removes a potential benefit to the special interest of the listed walls and to the setting and special interest of the house. With respect to the proposed new outer gates the application has been revised to show a simpler design, which is welcomed in principle, although the inclusion to the inner side of the gates of black metal screening is not appropriate, in that it would block views along the driveway

towards the listed gateway and house beyond. This screening should be removed from the proposed design.

The location of the proposed plant area has not been revised as previously recommended. Whilst I note the suggestion that the adjacent western driveway may be considered a more secondary approach, if a primary access from the east is formally re-established, for the reasons given above I do not consider that this can be given significant weight in the context of the current applications. It remains my opinion that this is not an appropriate location for a plant enclosure, and that this should be re-sited in a less visually prominent position. The design of the enclosure itself has been reconsidered, and whilst I appreciate the intention behind this is to sit the structure more comfortably in its context, I do not consider that this is sufficient to outweigh the harm caused by its overly prominent location. Similarly, although an explanation as to why the applicant considers the location appropriate has been provided, no assessment of other alternative positions is given. On that basis we have no evidence before us to demonstrate that the harm arising from the enclosure has been minimised, and the clear and convincing justification for this harm required by paragraph 213 of the NPPF is therefore lacking. This aspect of the proposal therefore remains contentious.

In summary, aspects of the proposal unfortunately remain contentious, and are considered to cause harm to the settings and special interest of the listed walls and gates, and of Wykehurst House. Although the heritage benefit potentially arising from the repair of the walls is noted, on balance the proposal remains contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. In terms of the NPPF, the proposal results in less than substantial harm, such that the balancing exercise set out in 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>

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