

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 August 2026 11:53:51 UTC+01:00
To: "Deborah Lynn" <Deborah.Lynn@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/26/1298 and 1421 57 and 58 Bramblehill Farm

Hi Debbie

Comments on the above planning and listed building consent applications.

57 and 58 Bramblehill Farm is a Grade II listed building, a former farmhouse, located in a rural position outside Turners Hill. The address reflects that the history of the property, which was built as a single dwelling in the early 17th century (according to the submitted Archaeological Interpretative Survey (AIS)), but extended to the south c.1900, at which time it appears to have been split into two cottages, which it remains to this day. The building has an integral outshot to the rear (western) side, which is contemporaneous with the construction of the house (and was also extended as part of the southern addition), and which sits under the lower part of an impressive catslide roof. The house appears to have been originally constructed with 3 bays and a central massive chimney stack, with a lobby-entry and stairs to the eastern side of the stack. It appears to have been floored from the outset, including attic accommodation. The ground floor accommodation was supplemented by rooms within the outshot, although it is suggested that these were originally used for animal penning and storage, and only later incorporated into the domestic accommodation. Various alterations were made to the building on its conversion to two cottages in the late 19th/early 20th century, including the above mentioned extension, underbuilding of the timber frame in brick and addition of tile hanging to the upper storeys, addition of the front facing gable, new windows and alterations to the plan form internally.

The current proposal, which was not preceded by pre-application advice, is for the reuniting of the two cottages into a single dwelling, with associated internal and external alterations including construction of a linked extension, which involves demolition of an existing external privy building.

To consider these works in turn:

Internal works:

Ground floor:

- Within the northern cottage, removal of partitioning and kitchen units within the outshot and construction of new partitioning, to create a rear hall, utility and cloak room. This work will not affect historic fabric or plan form and is not considered contentious.
- Adjacent to the front entrance doors to the cottages, removal of the partition separating the original lobby, with retention and fixing shut of one of the doors. This work will reinstate the original layout of the lobby entrance. Although the removal of the partition involves fabric and floor plan relating to a significant later

phase of the building's development (i.e. the subdivision of the farmhouse into two cottages), the retention of the double doors should ensure that this aspect of the building's history remains clearly legible. On balance, this aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious.

- Within the southern cottage, removal of the kitchen within the rear outshot to create a boot room. This aspect of the proposal affects only modern fabric and is not considered contentious.
- Also, within this cottage, removal of a modern partition adjacent to the inserted stairwell to combine the dining room and study. This is modern fabric and plan form, and its removal is not considered contentious.

First floor:

- Within the northern cottage, partial removal of the existing partitioning within the northern bay and insertion of new partitioning to create a single bedroom with ensuite. The submitted HIA is not clear on the date of the existing layout to this part of the building, and the analysis of the proposal within the document refers to other works at ground floor. The HIA requires correction and expansion on these points. Although I would doubt that the layout is original, it may date from the c.1900 subdivision into two cottages, and may therefore be of some interest. In addition, the location of the ensuite and the facilities within it raises concerns regarding impact on historic features including an 18th/early 19th century fireplace (including insert and surround), and exposed timber framing. The placement of the shower enclosure requires reconsideration for this reason. If the amendments to the plan form are acceptable, I would recommend that internal elevations are provided to show the disposition of the fittings and any associated tiling etc. in relation to any features, to confirm that this is acceptable. The nature of the flooring under the existing carpeting should be investigated and confirmed, as if historic floorboards are present as is the case to the southern cottage this will require careful consideration in terms of the flooring and pipework to the ensuite. Cutting through historic fabric of this nature to allow for pipe runs will not be acceptable.
- At second floor, removal of an existing partition within the northern cottage and construction of a new partition on a slightly different alignment to create an ensuite bathroom. Again, this work is not considered in the submitted HIA- this should be addressed, so that an informed assessment of the impact on the fabric and plan form of the house can be made. Again, this should include consideration of the nature and level of interest of the flooring, and confirmation of how new pipe runs will be achieved without damage to historic fabric.

External works:

- Demolition of an external privy. This curtilage listed structure, which is located close to the southern side of the building appears to date from c.1900, at the time when it was converted into two cottages, which is reflected in the provision of two privies within this one structure. In my opinion, although the privy building is relatively late, it is of some character, reflecting the alterations made to the main house around this time in materials and detailing, and its original purpose is still

clear. It contributes positively to the historical illustrative value of the listed building, in demonstrating the manner in which the building was lived in at that time, and being one of a pair also reflects an important phase in the development of the listed building, when it was converted from one dwelling to two. These factors reflect the manner in which the farmstead was then operating, and the socio-economic conditions of the time. As such, I would consider the privy to be of some interest in its own right, and also to make a positive contribution, through setting, to the special interest of the main house. For this reason, in my opinion the demolition of the structure is contentious and should be removed from the scheme.

- Construction of a single storey linked extension. A single storey extension is proposed to the northwest of the building, linked by a glazed link attaching to the southern side of the outshot, which is part of the c.1900 addition to the original building. The extension is shown as a brick-built structure under a barn hipped clay tile roof, with large windows to the western side. The extension is intended to provide a kitchen and dining area.

The existing house, notwithstanding the c.1900 addition to its southern end, which is well integrated, in my opinion appears as a completed composition and displays a very typical form for a building of its nature and period. The proposed extension, which is substantial in scale, despite the linking structure, will disrupt and detract from this characteristic form and footprint. It is a significant structure, set close to the house, and in my opinion is not appropriately subservient to the listed building.

At present, I am unconvinced that the principle of an addition to this already extended building which appears complete and coherent in its existing form can be supported. In terms of the current proposal, it is my opinion that because of its scale and form it detracts from the special interest of the listed building. The associated loss of the privy building, discussed above, exacerbates this harm.

- Creation of an additional window opening at attic level to the northern elevation. This aspect of the proposal, which is associated with the creation of an ensuite bathroom internally, raises concerns in terms of the impact on the fabric of the building. On site inspection would suggest that the location of the new window would result in the loss of fabric from the timber frame, which will be unacceptable. There may also be loss of original or early fabric from the infilling of the frame. Again, this aspect of the proposal is not considered by the submitted HIA; any revised proposal should be informed and accompanied by a revised and expanded appraisal document.

In summary, aspects of the proposal raise concerns in terms of the impact on the special interest of the listed building and its setting, including the curtilage listed privy. This will be contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. In terms of the NPPF, it will result in less than substantial harm, the exact level of which is difficult to assess given the absence of some relevant information from the HIA, but is likely to sit at around the mid or mid-high range of that scale.

I would suggest that the applicant would be best advised to withdraw the current application, and seek pre-application advice on any alternative scheme, which should be informed and accompanied by a fully detailed HIA.

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