

From: Emily Wade
Sent: 26 September 2025 09:37:28 UTC+01:00
To: "'Tracy Perry-Stere'" <Tracy@jamesclague.co.uk>
Cc: "Ryan Hagan" <ryan@er-productions.com>; "Katie Hagan" <katie@er-productions.com>
Subject: RE: Tanyard Manor DM/25/2009

Dear Tracy

Thank you for your email and my apologies for the delay in reply, we are busy at the moment.

I note your responses to the various points raised and these largely meet my concerns, with just a couple of points outstanding:

- Please can you confirm that the intention w.r.t. Bedroom 5 and the stairwell, where rafters are currently exposed, that this will remain the case? A
- re you able to provide details of the Keymer tile to be used at this stage? If not, a condition will be required, which could be worded as follows:
'Prior to commencement of work on the relevant part of the development, details of the replacement clay roof tile to be used shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Council'.
If you could let me know whether this is acceptable, that will help speed matters up. I would agree with you that a peg tile is likely to be preferable, for the reasons you give.
- I note your point regarding the access hatch and look forward to receiving the details of this. It will be helpful if these can include a commentary on the nature of the fabric effected as we would expect the work to avoid damage to historic fabric.

If you can please provide the amended plans mentioned, and subject to the above points, I think we would be in a position to move forward to a decision on the current application. I note that your client has decided to submit a separate application for the hung tile, which I think is sensible.

With respect to the point regarding Horsham slate, I think the conventional approach of replacing any shortfall with an appropriate clay tile to the upper slopes is probably preferable to using reclaimed stone, which as you note can be of dubious provenance. Again, if a note to this effect could be added to the plans that would be helpful.

With respect to the ceiling finishes, I would also add a condition requiring that any which are taken down are replaced like-for-like, however this can be worded as a compliance condition rather than one requiring further information.

With apologies again for the delay on our side, if you are able to get the revised plans and (if possible) information on the tile to me in the early part of next week I should be able to issue a decision swiftly after this.

I note your client's query regarding discharge of condition applications- as you know the target for these is 8 weeks. I will endeavour to get a decision to you as soon as possible within this time frame but due to pressure of other work I am afraid I can't offer any guarantees as to timings.

I look forward to hearing from you,

Kind regards,

Emily Wade

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: Tracy Perry-Stere <Tracy@jamesclague.co.uk>

Sent: 12 September 2025 17:26

To: Emily Wade <emily.wade@midsussex.gov.uk>

Cc: Ryan Hagan <ryan@er-productions.com>; Katie Hagan <katie@er-productions.com>

Subject: FW: Tanyard Manor DM/25/2009

Dear Emily,

Further to my previous comments I have now had the opportunity to discuss your response regarding the emergency repairs and the wall tile hanging with my clients and respond below.

They would be keen to understand how imminent the decision would be subject to your review of our response. They are likely to need several weeks to mobilise scaffolding and as such if the decision is likely within the next few weeks, this would give them much needed advance warning to secure weather protection at the earliest possible stage.

They confirm they will obtain some tiles as requested for consideration.

They would like to understand if the condition suggested for any required roof repairs would be discharged at the earliest possible convenience to allow for repairs and reinstatement to continue apace and without substantive delay (preferably not waiting the statutory 8 weeks?) We would be very pleased to engage directly with you on the works.

Finally, I confirm they wish to seek approval for the wall tiles in a new LBC application to avoid delay to the roof as the weather protection for the roof would serve to protect the walls where they are defective.

I look forward to your comments.

Kind regards,



Tracy Perry-Stere

Associate

James Clague Architects



01227 649073



Tracy@jamesclague.co.uk



www.jamesclague.co.uk



Latchmere House, 26 Watling Street, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 2UD

James Clague Architects is a limited company registered in England & Wales. Registered Number: 08664802. Registered Office Address: 27 Camburgh House, New Dover Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 3DN. This e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. Precautions have been taken to minimise the risk of viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail.

From: Tracy Perry-Stere <Tracy@jamesclague.co.uk>

Date: Thursday, 11 September 2025 at 11:09

To: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: Tanyard Manor DM/25/2009

Dear Emily,

Thank you for your consideration of our client's request. I have held off answering your previous response regarding adding the wall tiling until we established the way forward with the roof repair as it may be that the application is sufficiently protracted to account for the emergency works approach to make sense to include it (and indeed the wall tiling may also warrant investigation under emergency works). I respond **in line in red** below:



**Tracy Perry-St
ere**

Associate

James Clague Arc
hitects

01227 649073

Tracy@jamesclague.co.uk

www.jamesclague.co.uk

Latchmere House, 26 Watling Street, Canter
bury, Kent, CT1 2UD

James Clague Architects is a limited company registered in England & Wales. Registered Number: 08664802. Registered Office Address: 27 Camburgh House, New Dover Road, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 3DN. This e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. Precautions have been taken to minimise the risk of viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail.

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>

Date: Monday, 8 September 2025 at 16:03

To: Tracy Perry-Stere <Tracy@jamesclague.co.uk>

Subject: Tanyard Manor DM/25/2009

Dear Tracy

Further to your email of 4th September regarding the roofing repairs at Tanyard Manor, I have now had a chance to review the information submitted with the current listed building consent application, and have the following queries which I hope you can help me with:

- As I understand it, the proposal with the majority of the roof slopes, which are clad with plan clay tile, is to strip the roof entirely and to then reclad the roof using as much of the existing tile as can be cleaned and reclaimed, with new clay tile to match to make up any shortfall, new bat friendly roofing membrane, insulation, and associated works. Approximately what proportion of the existing tiles do you estimate will be re-usable? Can you indicate where you would anticipate using any new tile- i.e. would you expect to mix this among the reclaimed tile on all of the affected slopes, or to prioritise recovering certain roof slopes with reclaimed tile and concentrate the new tile elsewhere? Can you provide details of the proposed new tile to make up any shortfall now (this would avoid a pre-commencement condition)?

Your summary is correct. As my assessment is from drone survey I have not had the opportunity to inspect closely. It is not possible to determine the exact proportion of tiles which may need to be replaced until stripping occurs but at this stage I estimate 25-50%. There is spalling to the north slopes although not a lot of missing or cracked or

slipped tiles (suggestive of nail fatigue). I am certain the roof was recovered in the mid C20th at least and there is a mix of tiles of varying camber and cross camber as well as texture reflective of later manufacturing techniques. There are some very dark tiles, which warrant further inspection and may be worth replacing. I think the C17th range should be prioritised over the C20th for reinstating historic tiles, rather than the principal elevations in this instance as the gable to the west forms a natural junction. The new tile is likely to be a Keymer traditional handmade tile. I believe the tiles are peg tiles but will need to check a loose tile on site and I will arrange for some to be delivered to site to match the colour, camber and cross camber. The roofing contractor has suggested Keymer Shire nibbed range suggesting they are the larger format but I haven't checked this and I would have reservations about recreating the undulating line of the tile tails evident in peg tiles with a nib tile so I'm likely to push for a nailed peg to allow for some variation in position. I suppose the assessment of the quality of the tiles may determine if we in fact use the existing tiles on the rear slopes or C20th wing if they are not considered of best quality in sufficient proportions. I am less keen on mixing unless a good match can be sourced.

- With respect to the single Horsham slate roof slope to the 15th century wing, approximately what proportion of the existing HSS do you estimate you will be able to retain and re-use? Where a shortfall occurs, I would agree that accepted practice is to introduce clay tile to the upper part of the slope, and would have no objection in principle to this, but again can you please supply details of the tile to be used (which I would assume would be the same as above)?

This is impossible to determine as it can be so friable on removal. The roofing contractor has suggested obtaining reclaimed material but my understanding is this is not preferred practice? I would welcome your view on this. The tiles if used would be as decided for the above.

- The proposed re-covering should be indicated on the proposed elevations and plans and it would be helpful if the above details could also be included as appropriate (i.e. location of new as opposed to reclaimed tile or HSS).

We can mark the plans up upon your further comment to my comments above.

- With respect to the Proposed Attic Loft Construction Key, just to make sure I am understanding this correctly, can you confirm that the proposed pitched roof attic treatment (options A and B) applies only to the existing habitable rooms within the 17th century part of the building, i.e. bedroom 5 and the associated bathroom, bedroom and dressing room (as labelled on the attic loft plan), depending on the structural capacity of the sarking boards?

- Correct

- The remaining parts of the roof, including the remainder of the roof over the 17th century wing and that lying over the 15th and 20th century wings would not be insulated under the roof but between and above the ceiling joists, as per the bottom detail on the Construction Key?

- Correct

- Can you also please confirm that to Bedroom 5, the bathroom, dressing room and stairwell the ceiling/skimming is entirely as the top detail to the Key, i.e. rafters are currently concealed? I note that a plasterboard lining beneath the insulation is proposed, is the existing ceiling finish entirely plasterboard? I assume not as the existing section states that the ceiling finishes vary? Are there areas of lath and plaster surviving? N.B. that where lath and plaster survives, we would expect this to be replaced like-for-like.
- The rafters are exposed to bedroom 5 and the stairwell but underboarded to bedroom 6 (proposed dressing room and bathroom). Investigation has revealed this is modern machine sawn softwood lathes which were common by the end of the 19th century and most likely originating from the campaign of works in the early-mid C20th (photos attached). The plaster appears to be a haired lime plaster. This is evident to bedroom 5 in the walls where historic damage has occurred. We do not know for certain the finish to the ceilings to either rooms (underboarded and between rafters). We would replace in like for like and options A and B reflect this approach using breathable materials.
- A larger access hatch to the roof void above the 15th century wing is mentioned in the submitted Heritage Statement but does not appear to be shown on the plans- details of this should be provided and any impact on historic fabric noted.
- Thank you for noting this - we would like to create a more usable access hatch for maintenance and repair - I will forward details of the proposed hatch
- The specification of works within the Heritage Statement mentions possible repairs to the roof structure. Do you have any idea at present what the extent of this work is likely to be? Would you accept a condition requiring more information to be provided in respect of these repairs, bearing in mind that this may result in works being interrupted after the roof-covering is removed and the condition of the roof can be assessed? Such a condition could be worded along these lines (TBC):
 - - *'Prior to commencement of work on the relevant part of the scheme further details including an existing condition survey and full details of necessary repairs to the timber frame of the roof shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. These details should as appropriate include plans, elevations, sections, and a schedule of works including details of methods and materials to be employed.'*
- We have not identified any specific repairs at this stage. I am mindful the sarking board may be structural in some fashion. Yes, this would be both reasonable and acceptable.

With respect to your request that these works be treated as Emergency Works under Section 9(3) of the Act, although I have watched the videos submitted by your client which do indicate that there is an issue with water penetration, as the current application has now passed the consultation period, and as we have no objection in principle to the works subject to the above clarifications and further information I do not currently feel

that this is necessary or justified. It will be preferable if the above information can be submitted as quickly as possible; all being well a formal consent can then be issued and works can proceed in good time before the winter sets in. The current application target date is 8th October and provided that the information above is before us in a timely fashion I am confident that a decision can be issued within this timeframe.

I look forward to hearing from you,

Kind regards,

Emily Wade

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 information contained in this email may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Unless the information contained in this email is legally exempt from disclosure, we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this email to a third party making a request for information about the subject matter of this email. This email and any attachments may contain confidential information and is intended only to be seen and used by the named addressees. If you are not the named addressee, any use, disclosure, copying, alteration or forwarding of this email and its attachments is unauthorised. If you have received this email in error

please notify the sender immediately by email or by calling +44 (0) 1444 458 166 and remove this email and its attachments from your system. The views expressed within this email and any attachments are not necessarily the views or policies of Mid Sussex District Council. We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise you to carry out your own virus checks before accessing this email and any attachments. Except where required by law, we shall not be responsible for any damage, loss or liability of any kind suffered in connection with this email and any attachments, or which may result from reliance on the contents of this email and any attachments.