

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 November 2025 15:54:21 UTC+00:00
To: "Joanne Fisher" <Joanne.Fisher@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/25/2331 Townhouse Farm

Hi Jo

Comments on the above planning application.

The application site is a parcel of land to the far southern end of Church Lane, within the Ardingly Conservation Area. It is part of the former farmstead of Townhouse Farm, and is directly to the west and within the setting of the Grade II listed farmhouse. The historic farmstead also includes a number of former farm buildings to the northeast of the site, which would be regarded as curtilage listed. The site was previously occupied by substantial modern barns, which have now been demolished under an existing consent.

A further Grade II listed building is located a short distance to the north on Church Lane at Old Knowles. The site is considered to be within the wider setting of this building, in particular affecting the character of the approach to it along Church Lane, and the PROW which follows this road. Further PROWs run east-west across the southern boundary of the site, and south from here into the countryside beyond the village.

As noted above, there is an existing consent relating to the site for the demolition of the modern barns which previously occupied it and the construction of a detached 4 bedroom dwelling, with a garage and home office building and garden store, together with associated hard and soft landscaping works. This permission has been commenced and is therefore extant.

The current proposal is for a revised scheme with amendments to the footprint, massing and design of the new development. This application follows on from pre-application advice which discussed the proposed changes to the approved scheme, and during which it was advised that a vernacular agricultural aesthetic similar to the approval would be preferable to the originally suggested 'Sussex farmhouse' design.

The revised scheme retains the 'Sussex barn' typology of the approval, which was considered an appropriate response to the previous character of the site and its context, but amends the footprint of the development from three detached buildings as described above, to a main dwelling (the 'barn') with an attached 'outbuilding' providing further residential accommodation, and a detached garage and machine store which has a 'cartshed' aesthetic.

The position of the development within the site has been altered, with the house moved forward towards the southern site frontage. However, the attachment of the 'outbuilding' sets this further back so that the overall building line is in effect further to the north than

as approved. It is also now within the footprint of the previously present demolished barns.

The height of the main ridge to the 'barn' is slightly raised in comparison with the approval, and the attachment of the outbuilding to this element further increases the bulk of the house. However, the inclusion of a single storey link which is glazed to the southern elevation facing onto the PROW breaks up the mass of the building and placing the outbuilding adjacent to the barn results in a more compact development overall. On balance, the revised footprint and massing of the proposal are considered acceptable.

In terms of the detailed design and elevational treatment, the proposal is in some respects fairly similar to the approved scheme, particularly in terms of the 'barn', although changes have been made to the fenestration and to the garden room. These changes are considered acceptable, subject to further detail to be reserved by condition.

The attached 'outbuilding' has brick elevations over a stone plinth (rather than the weatherboarding which was approved), but this is an equally appropriate material in the context of ancillary agricultural buildings, and the contrast between the two finishes also acts to further break down the mass of the development. The fenestration and detailing of this part of the building, including the high level 'granary' door with shutters, are considered acceptable subject to further detail.

The detached garage building, as noted above, has a 'cartshed' aesthetic, including a stone plinth, weatherboarded elevations, a tiled roof with a catslide to one side, three openings with side hung timber doors, and an open sided log store with stone and timber posts. The design is considered sympathetic to the context, subject to detail to be reserved by condition.

On balance, therefore, the proposal is considered to preserve the settings of the adjacent listed buildings and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, meeting the requirements of District Plan Policies DP34 and DP35 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

I would recommend the following conditions:

- Facing and roofing materials
- Detailed drawings, at an appropriate large scale, including sections, and annotated to show materials and finishes, of the following:
 - - typical examples of windows and external doors, to each building, including garage doors and window shutters. Your drawings should as appropriate show depth of reveal
 - - typical eaves details to each building
 - - any necessary external flues or vents associated with the boiler, WCs and bathrooms

- Detailed hard and soft landscaping plan, to include elevations of any new or altered boundary treatments, fences, walls or gates and details of materials.
- Rooflights to be flush fitting, metal framed conservation style rooflights
- Rainwater goods and other external pipes to be of painted metal

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