

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 23 April 2025 15:00:42 UTC+01:00
To: "Katherine Williams" <Katherine.Williams@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: 142 High Street, Hurstpierpoint DM/25/

Hi Katherine

Comments on the above planning application.

The proposed development site is an unlisted mid terrace house located within the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area. The house, which appears to date from the late 19th or early 20th century, is part of a terrace of properties located to the southern side of the High Street, at its eastern end. The terrace appears to be similar in age, and are similar in style, although the pair at the eastern end (nos. 142-144) differ from the remainder of the row in having single storey bay windows to the front elevation, rather than the two storey bays present to the other houses in the group. The terrace is arranged into handed pairs of houses- nos. 142 and 144 are symmetrical in their form and façade treatment. No. 142 and the other houses along the terrace retain period features such as the bay windows, several with original sashes, and recessed porches with arched brick surrounds. The terrace has considerable character, and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area.

There are also a number of listed buildings in the vicinity, including the terrace at 159-171 High Street opposite, and Hampton Lodge just to the south east, which are both Grade II listed. No. 142 would be considered to be within the setting of these listed buildings.

The current proposals, which follow on from pre-application advice, are as follows:

DM/25/0674 – Demolition and replacement of an existing garage building to rear of the house.

The existing garage, which is located at the southern end of the rear garden adjacent to a lane which extends across the back of the terrace, is not of any particular architectural or historical merit, and its demolition and replacement is not considered contentious, subject to detail. The proposed replacement building is located further north into the garden, to allow for two off street parking spaces in front of it, and although described as a garage would appear in practice to be more of a garden outbuilding. Although the relocation of the building will result in some loss of garden space, the garden is relatively long, so that this is considered on balance acceptable. The design of the building is simple, with brick elevations and a pitched slate roof. This is not considered contentious, although the proposed rooflights to the roof appear boxy in profile and should be amended to flush-fitting, metal framed conservation style rooflights. The doors to front and rear should be of painted timber- this could be secured by condition. A condition should also be applied regarding details of roofing and facing materials, including the brickwork to the altered rear garden wall. Subject to this, the proposal is considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area, meeting the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

DM/25/0643- Rear single storey extension, new sash windows to the front elevation, and sun pipe to the rear roofslope.

The proposed single storey rear extension as submitted unfortunately does not follow the recent pre-application advice in that it wraps around the base of the rear of the existing two storey rear

wing, and also alters or replaces the existing single storey lean-to. In combination these features result in the dilution of the extent to which the original, characteristic T shape plan form of nos.142-144 can be appreciated, as well as the loss of the symmetry of their rear elevations. I would suggest as previously advised that the extension is reduced to an infill to the side of the existing rear range, retaining a nominal set back from the rear elevation of that range, and retaining the existing rear lean-to in its current form.

With respect to the replacement sash windows to the front elevation, given that the existing windows are uPVC the principle of replacement uPVC windows is likely to be difficult to resist, although it is regrettable that the applicant is not taking the opportunity to revert to timber, which would be a more appropriate and sustainable alternative.

The sun pipe is also not a traditional feature, but it is to the rear of the building, is modest in scale and set high in the roofslope. On balance, this aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious.

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