

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 23 April 2026 15:00:26 UTC+01:00
To: "Stefan Galyas" <Stefan.Galyas@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/25/0780 and 0781 Red House Farm, Cowfold Road, Bolney

Hi Stefan

Further comments on the above application, following the receipt of revised plans. For ease, I have added these in red to my previous comments, below.

In summary, in my opinion the principle of a two-storey extension remains unacceptable, and despite the reduction in bulk of the proposed addition it remains over scaled and inappropriately dominant in the context of the original modestly sized house.

Although I have read and considered the arguments made within the heritage response received, in my opinion the heritage benefit arising from some of the proposed internal alterations to the building does not outweigh the harm caused by the extension to it, particularly as some of these benefits could be achieved by a single storey addition similar to that for which approval has been previously granted. I also do not accept that the proposed work is necessary to achieve the optimum viable use of the building- there is no evidence before us to suggest that the extension is necessary for the ongoing residential occupation of the house, particularly given that a single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation at ground floor level has been granted consent.

In addition, the further information does not address previously expressed concerns regarding the potential loss of historic fabric from the first-floor rear elevation of the building resulting from the extension- there is no new information provided in terms of the date or level of interest of this fabric.

Furthermore, the proposal with respect to the 19th century outshot at the rear of the building remains the same, resulting in a loss of legibility and harm to this aspect of the building's narrative.

Lastly, no further information regarding the proposed roof repair works has been provided- the detail available in respect of this aspect of the scheme therefore remains insufficient.

In my opinion, therefore the proposal remains unacceptable for reasons of the scale, bulk and form of the proposed two storey rear addition, of potential associated loss of historic fabric from the first-floor rear of the building, and of adverse impact on the legibility of the 19th century rear outshot. In addition, insufficient information has been provided in relation to the proposed repair works to the roof of the house. For these reasons, the proposal remains contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34,

and will result in less than substantial harm to the special interest of the listed building, at around the midpoint of that scale. The balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 of the NPPF will therefore apply. In carrying out this exercise, the Council should be mindful of the requirement under paragraph 212 to give great weight to the conservation of heritage assets, and of that under paragraph 213 that any harm to a designated asset should require clear and convincing justification.

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 August 2025 12:22
To: Stefan Galyas <Stefan.Galyas@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/25/0780 and 0781 Red House Farm, Cowfold Road, Bolney

Hi Stefan

Comments on the above planning and listed building consent applications. I note that we have received an addendum Heritage Statement, and I have read and considered this as part of my response to the proposal.

Red House Farm is a Grade II listed former farmhouse located in a rural position outside Bolney. The building dates from the 17th century and was apparently originally constructed as

modest 3 bay hall house, the central bay open to the roof. The open hall was apparently floored during the 1700s, and the larger masonry chimney stack inserted at the centre of the building. This dating is taken from the original heritage statement submitted, but is an usually late date for this alteration locally. The original and addendum Heritage Statements collectively provide a brief timeline for the development of the building, and a more detailed analysis of fabric as existing, identifying early work and later alterations, although the survey drawings referenced are not included, and the sequence of construction and alteration of the building as set out in these documents is correspondingly somewhat difficult to follow.

Historical map regression shows an outshot to the centre of the rear of the building in place by the 19th century, which survives as an externally accessed store, and a further addition to the southern end of the rear elevation by c.1900. As existing, outshots to the rear and southern elevations are contained under a catslide roof wrapping around this corner of the building- the original heritage statement suggests that this is the result of 20th century alterations. This statement also suggests that the northern bay of the building was rebuilt during the 19th century. Further external and internal alterations took place during the 20th century.

Red House Farm is recorded in the West Sussex Historic Farmstead and Landscape Character assessment. Historic map regression suggests that the associated farm buildings were mostly grouped around the northern end of the pond which is located just to the west of the house, although there was a pigsty located directly to the north, no doubt in order make use of kitchen scraps. These buildings have now been lost, and there is an assemblage of more modern outbuildings to the west.

Planning permission and listed building consent were granted in 2022 for a single storey rear extension, with internal alterations to create a shower room at ground floor and bathroom at first floor.

The current proposal is for the construction of a two storey rear extension to the northern end of the building, with associated internal alterations at ground and first floor.

In my opinion, the proposed two storey rear extension is contentious in principle due to its impact on the characteristically modest scale of the building. Although it is set down in height from the main ridge of the house's roof, the addition remains substantial, in the context of the existing house, and in my opinion demonstrates an inappropriate relationship of scale with the historic core of the building, particularly when viewed in conjunction with the existing additions to the rear and to the south.

I note that the proposal has been revised to reduce the bulk of the addition at first floor, by lowering the eaves to the rear (west) side of the addition, and cutting back the line of the hipped roof to meet this lower point. A dormer has been added to the rear roof slope. However, in my opinion the principle of a two-storey extension remains contentious in the context of the characteristically modest scale of the existing building, and the addition remains over scaled and overly prominent in relation to the host building.

Whilst I note the point made in the heritage response regarding historical precedents for cross-wings to some buildings of this period within the locality, there is no evidence that such a wing was previously present at Red House Farm. The special interest of this

building lies in its own particular narrative as a modest 3 bay hall house of the 17th century, which has been altered over time, whilst clearly retaining significant elements of its original character. In my opinion the addition of a substantial 2 storey extension, if this could be interpreted as a cross-wing, would only confuse and detract from this narrative, and harm the original, and still clearly legible, character of the building, and its narrative.

The extension also appears awkward and overbearing in its abutment to the existing adjacent outshots and catslide roof, and detracts from the contribution made to the house's narrative by the 19th century or earlier external store (albeit that this may have been altered during the 20th century), which would become part of the internal accommodation.

These aspects of the proposal remain as previously described. I note again that the external store has been previously altered, but I consider that notwithstanding this it makes a positive contribution in its current form to the narrative of the building.

The proposed extension also entails some loss of fabric and features to the rear elevation of the northern bay of the house- two window openings altered and enlarged to make doorways, and one blocked up. The addendum Heritage Statement recently submitted suggests that there would be a possible survival of historic fabric at first floor level to the wall below the existing window opening- this would have required further investigation were the proposed extension considered otherwise acceptable. At ground floor the elevation appears to have been underbuilt during the 1950s and the works at this level are therefore not considered contentious.

No further information has been provided in respect of the date or level of interest of the fabric at first floor level to the rear elevation, and the potential loss of historic fabric remains a concern.

In association with the conversion of the external store to internal accommodation (a larder), it is proposed to remove and block up the external doorway, and to create a new internal door to the side elevation, which would link into the proposed rear extension. The loss of the external door, in my opinion, further erodes the character and legibility of this originally 19th century or earlier addition to the building.

As above, this aspect of the proposal has not been amended and in my opinion remains contentious. I note the argument in the heritage response that the store has been altered on more than one occasion, however its basic form and function remain clearly legible. The removal of the external door and its subsuming into the internal accommodation of the house would detract from the contribution that this 19th century addition to the building makes to the house's narrative and special interest.

Also externally, a new soil vent pipe is proposed towards the front of the northern side elevation, to serve the new bathroom at first floor. This will be an unattractive, and relatively prominent addition of visual clutter to the exterior of the building, which will detract from its appearance, including in views of the front elevation. This aspect of the proposal is in my opinion contentious, and would require reconsideration. I note that this is also highlighted as an issue within the addendum Heritage Statement.

The SVP is now internalised which addresses this concern, subject to detail and confirmation that historic fabric would not be adversely affected.

The proposed associated internal works affect mainly modern fabric, and in some instances reinstate elements of an earlier plan form, as is noted in the addendum Heritage Statement. At first floor, the subdivision of the northern bay to create a bathroom and reduced bedroom might in other circumstances be regarded as contentious, but here as the works also include the reinstatement of the original bay width by the relocation of the southern bedroom wall, and removal of partitioning within the central bay, the proposal is considered on balance acceptable. The internal works are therefore not in themselves considered on balance to be contentious. Further detail would be required by condition, were the application otherwise acceptable, regarding the detailing of the partitions and their relationship with adjacent/overlying historic fabric/timbers as appropriate.

The proposal also includes seemingly quite extensive repairs to the main roof of the house. Whilst this may not be considered contentious in principle, were the application more generally acceptable further, more specific information would be required in relation to the re-roofing works and also any associated repairs to the underlying historic roof structure, in terms of justification, method statements and drawings as appropriate to show the nature and extent of the works envisaged.

No further information on the repair works to the roof have been received. I would not agree with the heritage note that this information could be required by condition as we cannot at present be sure of the nature or scale of the work involved or the justification for it. Fine detail could be dealt with in this manner, but the nature and extent of the work and its acceptability in principle should be established during the course of the application.

In summary, the proposal raises concerns in terms of the scale and form of the proposed extension, and of aspects of the associated works to the existing building. In my opinion, this results in less than substantial harm at around the mid point of that scale to the special interest of Red House Farm and how this is appreciated. This will be contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF will apply.

See above.

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