

From: Nick Stickland <nick@sticklandwright.co.uk>
Sent: 08 April 2026 12:22:49 UTC+01:00
To: "Emily Wade" <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>; "Caroline Grist" <Caroline.Grist@midsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: "Anna Hobbs" <anna@sticklandwright.co.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/25/2654 and 2655 Wykehurst House (roof, rewiring and stonework)

Good afternoon, Caroline & Emily,

I write in response to your further comments (Emily's e-mail 30th March). To expedite an approval for some aspects of the 'urgent' repairs my client would like us to remove two of the still contentious parts of the submission, as follows:

The localised roof repairs have now been superseded by a new application by Clarion Surveyors (ref. DM/26/0768). This includes a more detailed roof survey of the existing condition generally and proposes FULL replacement of roof finishes. Over the winter period further leaks to the interior have occurred and this survey was commissioned as a result.

As a result of this new proposal, I believe it makes sense to now remove roof repair references from this submission. If you agree with this principle, we will 'wash' through our documents to remove this detail.

Similarly, our client would rather not delay any approval, awaiting availability of the heritage accredited engineer for the rear courtyard wall repair. The wall will continue to be supported with scaffolding and this element will be applied for separately when the reports are available. Again, we will remove references in the current submission.

The last matter refers to the warm air venting system in the house. Our client states that the metal ductwork in the basement was nearly entirely removed prior to acquisition. However, they confirm that embedded ducts in the walls remain, and original vent grilles will be retained generally, evidencing this historic servicing arrangement.

Kind Regards

Nick Stickland
Architecture Director
BSc BArch(Hons) ARB RIBA



t: 01273 964051

Brighton: 23 Vine Street, Brighton BN1 4AG

Isle of Wight: The Mews Cottage, 9 George Street, Ryde PO33 2EB

www.sticklandwright.co.uk

Company registered in England No. 11222477

The information contained in this email is intended only for the recipient to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Should you receive this message in error any review, dissemination, taking action in reliance upon its contents or any other use is strictly prohibited and you must notify the sender by return. Internet communications are not secure and whilst all care has been taken to virus check our own system Stickland Wright Ltd is not responsible for the integrity of any attachments included within

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: Monday, March 30, 2026 3:13 PM
To: Caroline Grist <Caroline.Grist@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/25/2654 and 2655 Wykehurst House (roof, rewiring and stonework)

Hi Caroline

Further comments on the above applications, following the receipt of further information. For ease, I have added these in **red** to my previous comments, below. I have highlighted areas where further information is required in **bold**, for clarity.

In summary the further information received is sufficient to demonstrate that several aspects of the proposal are acceptable, however there are a couple of areas, specifically the roof repairs, the replumbing works with respect to the retention of surviving elements of the original system, and the detail of the rebuilding of the service courtyard wall where previous concerns have not been fully 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>



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

Sent: 12 December 2025 16:53

To: Caroline Grist <Caroline.Grist@midsussex.gov.uk>

Subject: DM/25/2654 and 2655 Wykehurst House (roof, rewiring and stonework)

Hi Caroline

Comments on the above planning and listed building consent applications.

Wykehurst House is a Grade II* listed mansion dating from 1872-4, and built to a design by noted architect E M Barry. The house, which is in the French chateau style, is located in a rural position outside Slaugham. It sits in extensive grounds of landscaped parklands; the forecourt to the northern side of the house is surrounded by a stone balustrade, with eagle-topped gate piers and wrought iron gates which are listed Grade II. Some distance to the east, the East Lodge is located at the entrance to the park from London Road. This building, which is also by Barry and similar in style to the house, is also Grade II listed. The West Lodge on Colwood Lane is a later building (late 19th/early 20th century) and is not listed, but is likely to be regarded as either curtilage listed or as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA), as are the stables and coach house buildings which survive to the north of the mansion (more information would be required to decide which would apply). Surviving elements of the original walled garden and glasshouses which are also to the north of the house, but now part of the gardens to a modern house known as Carisbrooke Manor may also be regarded in this manner.

The submitted heritage statement includes a summary of the development and significance of the house. This notes that alterations were made during the 1930s, when the building was in use as a hotel, and then following requisition by the Canadian army during WWII fell into a long period of disuse and decay. The building was purchased in 1971 by antiques dealer James 'Jimmy' Doyle who gained planning permission to convert it into 12 flats, one of which the Doyle family lived in. At this time further alterations were made including the installation of a new entrance door, stair and lift, commencement of a swimming pool at basement level (works were not completed), extension of the master bedroom suite into the principal stair case, rebuilding or restoration of the original floors, removal of a glass roof to create an internal courtyard,

and new floors and roofs over the basement level workshop and kitchen, to extend the ground floor space. The principal reception rooms were restored, but not all of the work was of a high standard. Many original features of the house seem to have been lost during the period of decay, or were subsequently sold off by Mr Doyle.

The family flat was sold on in 1978 to Mr Golestan, who remained the owner until its recent purchase by the applicant, and who appears to have incrementally acquired the remaining 11 flats within the building, returning it to a single ownership. The property was listed in 1983. Works carried out by Mr Golestan appear to include further alterations within the incomplete pool complex area, changes to windows and openings throughout, further repair works including to the ground floor and waterproofing of the basement, and recovering of the internal courtyard created by Mr Doyle.

The Heritage Statement contains an Assessment of Significance- based on the information within this document I would agree that the special interest of the building in architectural terms lies principally in its surviving original design, construction, and fabric, with later fabric and alterations being of less interest or in many cases detrimental to the significance of the house.

The current proposal, which is partly retrospective, is for internal and external works comprising:

- Repairs to the roof including replacement of missing tiles, replacement of leadwork, and installation of lightning protection;
- Replacement of timber windows, timber framework and cracked or missing window panes;
- Rewiring throughout;
- Replumbing throughout;
- New heating and underfloor heating;
- Repairs to external stonework; and
- Replacement/rebuilding of the courtyard wall.

To consider these works in turn:

- Roof repairs etc.: We have insufficient information here for an informed assessment of the works which have been undertaken. A condition report, and detailed schedule of the works should be provided, ideally cross-referenced to the existing and proposed roof plans. Details of the replacement roof tile used to make up any shortfall should be provided.

We have received a more detailed commentary on the condition of the roof at the time that the building was acquired by the applicant, including some photographs. As this application is partly retrospective, and it would appear that a survey was not undertaken prior to works commencing, this may be the most detail that we can expect in terms of the roof's previous condition. It is at least apparent from the photographs that repairs were urgently required.

However, we still have not been provided with the detailed schedule of works that have taken place/are proposed, cross-referenced with roof plans, which was requested. Without this information we are unable to

assess the extent or nature of the roofing repairs which the applicant is seeking to regularise/complete. I would assume given the recent and ongoing nature of the work that this should be available from the applicant and/or their contractors, and should be provided.

With respect to the replacement tiles, whilst the principle of reclaimed tiles to match the existing is not considered contentious, we have no detailed information regarding these. I appreciate that due to the number required they may have to come from more than one source, but we would expect at the least photographs of typical examples, plus whatever detail is available of the tiles' provenance, e.g. reclamation yard or yards. This could be requested by condition, but the applicant may wish to avoid any further delay by providing this information now.

- Replacement windows: Although we have detailed drawings indicating that the windows have been replaced like-for-like, we do not have a condition report to justify the loss of the previous, presumably original windows, or elevations to show their locations.

Further information has been provided on the previous condition of the windows, which although it does not constitute a condition report, is helpful in demonstrating their poor repair, and is probably in the circumstances the most detail which can be expected. We also have annotated elevational photographs to show the locations of the windows replaced. Alongside the original submission, I would consider that this aspect of the proposal is now demonstrated to be acceptable in terms of its impact on the special interest of the listed building.

- Replumbing throughout: The submitted email from Mittens Plumbing and the accompanying Water Services plans are not sufficient for a full understanding of the work which has been undertaken, the justification for it, or its potential impact on historic fabric (it is understood that this aspect of the proposal is retrospective). A more detailed condition report of the previously existing water system should be provided, alongside a detailed schedule of the new work which has been undertaken. Separate existing and proposed plans should be provided - it is not clear which we currently have in front of us, and no indication of changes to pipe routes etc. is given. The Heritage Statement should be expanded to give a more detailed consideration of the impact on the historic fabric of this work.

Further information has been provided including a more detailed description of the previous nature and condition of the plumbing system, and a method statement for its replacement which states that the works were carried out to minimise impact on historic fabric. Although this is not the level of information which we would ideally have before us in the context of a prospective application, in the circumstances it is probably the best we can hope for and does provide some reassurance that the surviving historic fabric was respected. In the context of the retrospective nature of the works, and bearing in mind the level of previous alteration to the property, I would not raise an objection to this aspect of the proposal.

- New heating: Further information is required to describe the proposals in this respect, including more detailed existing and proposed plans highlighting any

new work, and a detailed schedule of works. A more detailed consideration of the impact on historic fabric should also be provided.

We have received further information regarding the previous condition of the heating systems within the building, indicating that the provision was inadequate and, in some respects, potentially hazardous to the historic fabric of the building. While the original heating system would have been technically advanced for its time, it is no longer fit for purpose, and I would not expect that this would be capable of re-use. **I would however ask for further information from the applicant to demonstrate that elements of the original system which may be of interest in terms of their illustrative value have been retained.** The newer elements of the previously existing system relate to 20th century alterations and are not considered of special interest. The removal and replacement of these later elements is not considered contentious in principle. The submitted methodology indicates that while extensive works have been undertaken to strip these out and install a new system, these works have been carried out with the intention to respect and preserve historic fabric wherever possible. In the context of this retrospective proposal, and given the extent and nature of works to the building apparently carried out by previous owners, this aspect of the proposal is considered on balance acceptable, subject to the above point regarding the original system.

- Underfloor heating: The information in this respect is inadequate. There is no indication of whether this work has already been undertaken or not. There is no detail beyond what appear to be plans of feeder pipes(?) at basement and ground floors of the extent or nature of the system, its relationship with the existing floor structures/finishes, or the extent of any impact on historic fabric. More detailed plans, including room plans and typical sectional details, should be provided, alongside a detailed methodology and impact statement.

The further information received makes it clear that this is not conventional underfloor heating, but trench heating shown to the periphery of floors to the main reception rooms at ground floor and the master bedroom at first floor. This requires some loss of the existing floor boards and cutting of underlying floor joists, which may result in some loss of historic fabric; however it is accepted that many of the floor structures within the building have been altered or replaced due to previous internal changes and to the disrepair of the house during the mid 20th century. This approach also removes or reduces the need for wall-mounted radiators which may be visually intrusive and/or harmful to historic panelling or wall finishes within the rooms concerned. On balance, this aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious.

- Repairs to external stonework: Whilst we have the covering letter/report from Traditional Stone and their costing, we do not have the photographic record mentioned at page 4 of the report, which presumably contains further information as to the existing condition of the building and areas where various works are proposed. At present, whilst I would not argue with the need for repair work to the elevations of the building (not least to put right earlier poor repairs noted on site, where the masonry appears to have been cut into with power tools), we will need further, more detailed information of the current proposals for a fully informed

assessment of their impact on the building and its fabric. If the above-mentioned photographic survey is, as I suspect, cross-referenced to the detailed costing document, this may be sufficient.

We have now received the stonework condition survey indicating areas where repairs are required, alongside some before and after photographs of a sample repair of previous poorly undertaken repair work, and of stone cleaning. In conjunction with the information already received, this is sufficient to demonstrate the extent and nature of the works which are proposed, as well as the existing condition of the building which is the justification for these works. This aspect of the proposal is now considered acceptable.

- Replacement/rebuilding of the courtyard wall: It is proposed to demolish and rebuild to a different design incorporating foundations and a concrete retaining structure a section of the existing stone courtyard wall to its southern side. However, although we have photographs which show a degree of cracking and distortion to the existing wall, as well as details of the proposed method of rebuilding, we do not have the following, which will be necessary for a fully informed assessment of the proposal:
 - - a structural report from a conservation-accredited structural engineer which examines the existing condition of the wall and sets out the need for its demolition and rebuilding to the extent shown, as opposed to more localised repair.
 - - this same report should also explain the justification for rebuilding the wall to a different design including a concrete retaining structure and new foundations.
 - - details of the replacement stone which will be used to make up any shortfall, should the existing not be re-usable in its entirety.

The applicant has provided further detail explaining the reason for the movement of the wall, which has been caused by a tree which was previously growing adjacent to it. The further information explains that the existing stone blocks will be dismantled, the tree stump and roots removed, and the stone then reinstated. It is anticipated that the existing stone should be re-usable, with no need for replacement. Whilst this does not constitute a structural report, in my opinion given the proposal to rebuild using the existing stone blocks, and the movement which is evident on site, these aspects of the submission are adequate and acceptable in principle.

However, the further information submitted indicates that there is continuing uncertainty regarding the potential need for the secondary retaining wall. Without this, it is not possible to comment on whether this aspect of the proposal is acceptable in its entirety. It would appear that this should be forthcoming when an engineer's report is received, so I would suggest that the applicant confirm when this will be provided.

In summary at present we do not have sufficient information for an informed assessment of the proposals or their potential impact on the special interest of the listed 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