

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 September 2025 16:32:02 UTC+01:00
To: "Anna Tidey" <anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/25/1168 and 1169 Annexe, Keysford

Hi Anna

Further comments on the above application following the receipt of further information and revised plans. In terms of the order in which the outstanding issues are addressed I will broadly follow the order set out in previous email exchanges, which will hopefully be helpful:

- Mezzanine floor to the northern bay- revised plans were expected to show the partitioning omitted- these have been received and are acceptable.
- Further details of the stair to the northern bay, and of impact on threshing floor- the stair has been omitted in favour of ladder access, which is welcomed as this removes the potential for adverse impact on the threshing floor from this aspect of the proposals. Elevational drawings including details of the ladder access and proposed glazed balustrade have not been provided but I would be happy for these to be reserved by condition.
- Works to the part-height partition- we now have detailed elevational drawings to show the proposed 'door' to be cut into the partition showing the position in relation to the carved alphabet and taper burn marks. Whilst as mentioned previously I think this is an acceptable approach in principle, the elevations show that the door would be cut through the part of the partition carrying the taper burns- although the fabric in question is shown as retained as part of the door this is not in my opinion ideal and I would suggest that the door is repositioned to the opposite (eastern) end of the partition to avoid impact on this more significant part of the partition's fabric.
- Amendments to side hung barn doors- We have received amended plans showing a side hung barn doors retained. This is acceptable, subject to detail which could be reserved by condition.
- Rooflight proportions and impact on rafters- We have revised proposed elevations confirming that the rooflights will oversail the existing roof structure, so that impact on historic fabric will be minimised. This is welcomed. However, the dimensions of the rooflights do not appear to have been amended- as noted previously these dimensions would benefit from reduction to ensure that they are not overly prominent in the affected roof slopes._
- Enlargement of existing opening to eastern elevation- internal elevations have been provided which show the opening increased in height, rather than width, to minimise the impact on historic fabric. This means that no adjacent studs will now be cut. On balance, this aspect of the proposal is considered acceptable. I note however that the revised proposed plan does not appear to have been updated to include this detail, as the opening is still shown widened on this plan- this requires amendment.

- Installation of insulation roof and walls. The build up/out of roof and walls is now indicated on the proposed plans and elevations, and we have typical sectional details, but we do not appear to have the details requested with respect to the impact on the eaves of the building or the junction between the cladding and the brick plinth at the base of the external elevations. The sectional detail provided would be acceptable in terms of its impact on the internal character of the building in that the framing remains fully exposed, but the build out/up of the external envelope as shown is worryingly deep. The above mentioned further details would be useful to understand the impact of this further, but as it stands I am concerned that build up/out is so marked it may be harmful to the external appearance of the building. If the depth of the insulation cannot be reduced, the applicant may need to consider an alternative solution such as placing the insulation partly between the members of the timber frame and partly externally, so that the framing remains exposed internally, albeit to only part of its current full depth, whilst ensuring that the impact on the external dimensions and detailing of the building is less significant. This aspect of the proposal requires further information/consideration to achieve an appropriate balance and an acceptable impact on both the internal and external appearances of the building.
- Insulation to the floor- I note the section within the DAS suggesting that the timber threshing floor will be carefully lifted and relaid over new insulation, which is acceptable in principle, but we do not have the detailed method statement from a suitably experienced contractor which was previously discussed. I remain concerned that although it is the applicant's intention to preserve this important aspect of the building's character, we have insufficient assurance that the works as proposed are practically achievable. We also do not appear to have further information with respect to the historic brick floors elsewhere to the building.
- Details/features of interest to be retained- we now have further information with respect to a number of the features of interest within the building to confirm their retention, which is helpful. This is by a combination of annotations on the proposed plan, and information within the revised DAS. However, there are some outstanding points here:
 - - the taper burn to the intermediate post in truss D within the northern bay is marked as retained exposed within the DAS but retained and covered on the proposed plan. This requires clarification- it would be better retained exposed if possible.
 - - no information is provided regarding the pigeon loft to the southern gable internally.
 - - please see above w.r.t the taper burns to the part height partition.
 - - I can't find any mention of the intention w.r.t. the shadow line of a missing window head, and exposed notches for a mullion window to the western girt (p.30. of the AIS).
 - - As per previous comments, the existing door to the southern side of the rear outshot is to be replaced (as noted above) and the door re-used internally to bedroom 1. While this is acceptable in principle, it should be shown on the proposed plans.

In summary, while further significant positive steps have been taken, there are details which require further information and/or reconsideration prior to any decision- most notably the details now in front of us regarding the external insulation of the building have raised concerns in relation to the impact on the external appearance of the building.

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