

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 January 2026 11:20:19 UTC+00:00
To: "Katherine Williams" <Katherine.Williams@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Lloyds Pharmacy, High Street, Cuckfield DM/25/2857 and 2942

Hi Katherine

Further comments on the above application following the receipt of revised information.

Further/revised information has been received in terms of a corrected Design and Access Statement and revised visuals to show the paint colours to the façade. This addresses the previous concerns with respect to inconsistencies between the submitted documents. With respect to the paint, further information has been provided including clearer visuals. On balance, this aspect of the proposal is now also considered acceptable.

The proposal is therefore considered to preserve the special interest of the listed building 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:

- Details of facing material to the exposed rear elevation where the extension removed.
- Detailed drawings including elevation and sections, at an appropriate large scale, and annotated to show materials and finishes, of new window and new internal and external doors.
- Detailed hard and soft landscaping scheme to the rear garden area where the extension is removed.
- New or altered external pipework 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>



From: Emily Wade

Sent: 10 December 2025 16:05

To: Katherine Williams <Katherine.Williams@midsussex.gov.uk>

Subject: Lloyds Pharmacy, High Street, Cuckfield DM/25/2857 and 2942

Hi Katherine

Comments on the above planning and listed building consent applications. My apologies for the delay in getting these to you, which has been caused by pressure of other work.

Firstly, I would note that there appear to be some inconsistencies between the works as described in the submitted Design, Access and Heritage Statement, for example with respect to the southern section of the ground floor removal of redundant partitions is described in the Statement, but not reflected in the existing/proposed floor plans. The Statement also mentions reinstatement of two windows to the rear elevation, but only one is shown on the drawings. The works to remove pipes and conduits associated with the removal of the rear addition described in the Statement are not shown on the elevations.

The application site is a Grade II listed building located in a prominent position within the Cuckfield Conservation Area. The building, which dates from the mid 19th century, is a three storey house with a shop frontage to one side at ground floor- historical map regression suggests this may have been added in the late 19th or early 20th century.

The current proposal is for change of use of part of the ground floor from shop to residential, with associated external and internal alterations comprising removal of a single storey rear extension, repainting to a different colour palette, and alterations to the plan form at ground floor. To consider these proposals in turn:

- The proposed change of use of part of the ground floor from shop to residential is not considered contentious in principle, provided that we are satisfied that this would not adversely affect the viability of the retail unit. The site is located within

the commercial heart of Cuckfield village, and the continuing presence of a varied mix of uses, including retail, is important to the character of this part of the Conservation Area. As the shop element appears to be either original, or an early introduction to the listed building, it would also be considered to contribute to its narrative and hence to its special historical interest.

- The existing rear single storey extension is an unattractive addition dating from the 1970s and detracts from the appearance and special interest of the building. Its removal is welcomed, subject to detail of the reinstatement of the underlying rear elevation, including the replacement window.
- The proposed internal alterations at ground floor are relatively minor, comprising removal of a cubicle inserted to the front of the shop space, new partitioning and blocking of a door towards the rear. This part of the building appears much altered, and although there may be some impact on original plan form from the works to the rear of the space, this must be balanced against the removal of the cubicle to the front, which is located directly behind the shop window. On balance, this aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious.
- In terms of the repainting of the building, whilst this is not considered contentious in principle, care should be taken that the palette is sympathetic to the period of the building and its context. Could the applicant therefore provide further information including perhaps a coloured image of the building in full daylight? The 'mock up' provided appears to be illustrative of 'dusk' lighting, and does not show the paint colours clearly. It also does not show the proposed treatment of the architectural features to the façade such as the pilasters to either side of the elevation and the architraves above the central windows- none of these features appear at all on the proposed coloured elevations, which I am hoping does not indicate it is intended to remove them (which would be unacceptable)? As these are key features of the building, it may not be appropriate to disguise them by painting them in the same colour as the rest of the elevation- this should be considered and demonstrated in the information provided. This aspect of the work should also be discussed in the Heritage Statement.

In summary, although the majority of the works proposed are considered either uncontentious (subject to detail), or beneficial, the repainting of the façade requires further consideration and fuller information. The inconsistencies between the plans and supporting statement should also be addressed.

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



No ID? You can apply for free voter ID
Find out more at

electoralcommission.org.uk/voterID

or call 0800 328 0280