

JUSTIFICATION

REAR EXTENSION

The following comments were received from the Heritage Officer regarding the original design of rear extension:

- *The existing rear extensions are modern in date- their removal is not considered contentious in principle.*

RESPONSE: Removal of rear extensions approved

- *Although I do think there is scope for the replacement/ reconfiguration of the existing rear additions, the proposal as shown raises concerns in terms of bulk, form, detailed design and materials. At ground floor the footprint of the proposed replacement addition is reduced in comparison to the existing. However, at first floor the extension is both wider and deeper, resulting in increased apparent bulk notwithstanding the reduced roof height- this will be particularly apparent in views from the side, and in particular from the south. The boxy form of the extension with extensive flat roofing will exacerbate this affect, and is unsympathetic to the historic roof form of the building and to the character of the wider area. The elevational treatment, with the recessed balcony with a large glazed opening, and the different facing material at first floor, all serve to further draw attention to the first floor and enhance its undue visual prominence.*

RESPONSE: Analysis of the ‘as-built’ rear extension further into this chapter addresses design concerns

- *The proposed rear addition also raises concerns in terms of its internal layout- one of the more positive features of the existing modern ground and first floor additions is that they exhibit a relatively ‘light touch’ in terms of the interface with the original rear elevation of the building, which remains visible internally. The proposal shows partitioning to the north eastern corner of the extension adjacent to the original rear elevation to create a pantry and utility at ground floor and a bathroom at first floor. This compartmentation of the space will adversely affect, if not remove, the current appreciation of the height and framing of this part of the rear elevation, an affect which will be compounded by the placement of features such as a shower cubicle against the wall. This aspect of the proposal is also considered to adversely impact the special interest of the proposal and how it is appreciated.*

RESPONSE: The ‘as built’ ground floor layout closely matches the layout of the approved scheme, introducing the compartmentalisation for utility/pantry in the north-eastern corner of the extension. It is considered ‘light-touch’ and to be in accordance with approved scheme.

- *The proposed extension involves the substantial loss of the fabric of the existing c.1830 rear two storey wing, with the internalisation of what little remains. In my opinion, which is broadly consistent with the commentary given within the Heritage Statement, this wing is of historical and architectural interest as an integral part of the 19th century alterations to the property, a key phase in its development, and contributes positively to its narrative. It is also an attractive and characterful feature of the rear elevation, in particular the original window and brickwork. For these reasons I consider that the extensive and destructive works proposed to this element of the building are contentious in principle. I do not consider that the internalisation of the first floor rear façade of the wing as a ‘feature’ within the bedroom space created will sufficiently preserve its interest.*

RESPONSE: The original gabled rear wing on the building is retained. It is partially visible on the rear elevation and its historic plan form is retained and legible in the new extension. The approved scheme allows the demolition of the ground floor element of this wing, diluting the plan form at this level, so retaining it and internalising it at first floor ensures the legibility of the plan form relating to this early 19th century wing is retained.

It is proposed for the historic brickwork wall and Victorian window to be made good and exposed internally, celebrating the original features of the house. This is much the same as the west/ rear wall of the original 15th century elements of the dwelling. By following this design language, internalising the window is in fact in accordance with the design language already present in the house.

Please refer to further pages within this document and to the Heritage Statement prepared by HCUK for detailed justification of the undertaken works to Marlow House and associated site.



1. Proposed rear elevation - to remain as existing, constructed in broad accordance with the originally submitted drawings under application DM/22/3694 & DM/22/3695.



2. Proposed rear elevation - originally submitted drawings under application DM/22/3694 & DM/22/3695.

JUSTIFICATION

REAR EXTENSION

The adjacent plans illustrate how:

1. The historic plan form is retained and legible in the ‘as-built’ extension. The gabled outrigger is retained and incorporated within the new extension at first floor in accordance with the approval.

2. The ‘as-built’ ground floor extension layout complies with the approved drawing with minor deviation to utility room.

This comparison addresses the Conservation Officer’s comment: *‘The proposed rear addition also raises concerns in terms of its internal layout- one of the more positive features of the existing modern ground and first floor additions is that they exhibit a relatively ‘light touch’ in terms of the interface with the original rear elevation of the building, which remains visible internally. The proposal shows partitioning to the north eastern corner of the extension adjacent to the original rear elevation to create a pantry and utility at ground floor and a bathroom at first floor. This compartmentation of the space will adversely affect, if not remove, the current appreciation of the height and framing of this part of the rear elevation, an affect which will be compounded by the placement of features such as a shower cubicle against the wall. This aspect of the proposal is also considered to adversely impact the special interest of the proposal and how it is appreciated.’*

RESPONSE: The ‘as built’ ground floor layout closely matches the layout of the approved scheme, introducing the compartmentalisation for utility/pantry in the north-eastern corner of the extension. It is considered ‘light-touch’ and to be in accordance with approved scheme.



Historic map of 1874


KEY:

- Outline of the 1987 historic plan form of site according to record
- Highlighted ‘light touch’ open plan ground floor layout
- ‘Of rear extension

107 HIGH STREET, LINDFIELD, HAYWARDS HEATH, RH16 2HR



1. ‘As built’ ground and first floor plans - deviation from application DM/22/3694 & DM/22/3695



2. Approved ground and first floor plans - submitted under application DM/22/3694 & DM/22/3695

JUSTIFICATION

REAR EXTENSION

The following is a comparison between the 'pre-construction' building to the approved and 'as-built' schemes.



2. APPROVED REAR ELEVATION

Submitted drawings under application DM/22/3694 & DM/22/3695 (planning approved).



1. PROPOSED REAR ELEVATION

To remain as existing, constructed in broad accordance with the originally submitted drawings under application DM/22/3694 & DM/22/3695.

ANALYSIS:

- The historic plan form is retained and rear gable visible, revealing a great amount of the existing house. This however results in a fragmented, unbalanced collection of volumes of differing styles and in different planes.
- No clear datums across elevation (refer to the analysis on following page)
- Victorian window is exposed, however its style clearly contrasting with other openings adds to the patchwork-like appearance of the facade
- The proposal does not compliment the qualities of the listed building and detracts attention from it
- The variety of materials across the facade add to its fragmented, chaotic appearance with each mass and material treatment in a different plane
- Pitched roof above the bathroom forms an unusable internal room behind due to pitch of roof linking to bake house roof
- The approved design is unbalanced at ground floor with the flanking boundary wall forming an awkward parapet to the neighbouring property
- First floor opening sizes are unbalanced, soldier course lintel treatment to bakehouse rear elevation is out of character
- Flat roof construction has already substantially enveloped a substantial amount of the gable, whilst the first floor extension has also encroached over it too, affecting it's composition and compromising it's appearance
- Awkward eaves detail where flat roof meets pitch of outrigger gable, with timber screening in front too perpendicular to the facing brickwork
- The approved roof plan shows flat roof to the northern part (above bathroom), this elevation is misleading and the scheme has been built in accordance with the roof plan

ANALYSIS:

- The proposal reveals greater amount of the original building as it is reduced in mass and demonstrate subservience. The original is more legible and harm caused by the unsympathetic 21st century extensions is undone.
- The new extension stands out clearly from the existing building emphasizing the new modern construction rather than attempting to blend it with the historic fabric
- The historic plan form is retained and legible in the extension at both ground and first floors
- The horizontal volume, spanning the full width of the existing house, presents a more linear and elegant form compared to the fragmented and disjointed collection of volumes on the approved scheme. There was two volumes prior to the planning approved scheme, within which the language of two forms was diluted, but the as built scheme re-instates the second subservient volume to the rear of the original 15th Century building fronting the high street, but with a flat roof instead of a pitched roof
- Victorian window and gable wall are concealed by new extension but exposed and celebrated internally
- The extension is reduced in height compared to the approved scheme, exposing more of the historic gable
- There are clear datum lines across the facade (refer to the analysis on following page) making it more visually appealing
- Composition of volumes is centralised and balanced
- The materiality of the facade is limited and considered
- Roof infill behind bake house frames its roof and allows it to clearly stand out
- Top of the historic gable remains visible, referencing historic outrigger gable
- Historic gable wall remains visible through large glazed openings on the first floor


JUSTIFICATION

REAR EXTENSION

The following is a comparison between the 'pre-construction' building to the approved and 'as-built' schemes.

KEY:


- Singular datum
- Continuous datum



1. Rear elevation of the building prior to any works.

ANALYSIS:


- The elevation is fragmented with no clear datums set by openings.
- One clear datum set by conservatories
- Chaotic composition of different types, styles and sizes of doors and windows



2. Approved rear elevation - submitted drawings under application DM/22/3694 & DM/22/3695 (planning approved).

ANALYSIS:

- The approved design demonstrates the same issue of fragmented elevation and lack of clear datums set by openings.
- One clear datum set by ground floor openings
- Several proposed and approved rooflights to the 15th century house roof add to the chaotic appearance of the rear elevations



3. Proposed rear elevation

ANALYSIS:


- The 'as-built' scheme demonstrates clear datums set both by massing of new extension and its openings. The elevation is unified, well considered and contemporary
- Approval of rooflights to historic roof was omitted, resulting in a less busy, elegant facade and less interference into historic fabric of 15th century house

JUSTIFICATION

REAR EXTENSION

The following is a comparison between the ‘pre-construction’ building to the approved and ‘as-built’ schemes.

The historic outrigger is currently visible through the large glazed openings. It is proposed for the original brickwork walls to be exposed, enhancing the visibility and reading of the outrigger in the view from the rear garden.



Recent photograph showing mass of historic outrigger visible through glazed openings - walls painted white



Proposed enhanced visibility of the historic outrigger - original brickwork walls exposed



1. Rear elevation of the building prior to any works.



2. Approved rear elevation - submitted drawings under application DM/22/3694 & DM/22/3695 (planning approved).



3. Proposed rear elevation

JUSTIFICATION

REAR EXTENSION

The rear of the property is not clearly visible from the public realm, so its ‘visual prominence’ would only be seen from the neighbouring gardens and upper level windows of the surrounding properties. Additionally, this proposal received several letters of support from occupiers of neighbouring properties, which can be found further into this chapter.

The 45-degree rule, derived from the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidance, is a planning rule used to assess the impact of proposed extensions on a neighbour’s natural light, ensuring that new developments don’t unduly block sunlight into habitable rooms. The 45-degree rule was applied to determine if the ‘as-built’ extension blocks sunlight from entering a neighbour’s habitable room windows.

109 High Street

Building at 109 High Street does not have ground floor windows facing towards the site, therefore there is no impact on the daylight amenity access caused by the extension.

105 High Street

There is one kitchen window on the northern elevation of 105 High Street building rear extension and one window to the first floor bedroom.

As visible on the following page floor plans, the ground floor kitchen is a dual aspect space. The daylight amenity is therefore not impacted.


As demonstrated on the adjacent diagram, the first floor bedroom window amenity is also not affected by the rear extension.

The approved scheme proposed a window to the first floor bedroom on the south elevation. Despite timber screening in front of it, due to its location close to neighbouring property it could cause an overlooking issue. The window and risk of overlooking has been omitted in the ‘as-built’ house.




KEY:


1. 105 High Street
2. 107 High Street -The Site
2. 109 High Street



‘As-built’ west elevation, 25 degree rule diagram



‘As-built’ block plan, 45 degree rule diagram



Approved first floor plan


JUSTIFICATION

REAR EXTENSION

The adjacent are floor plans of neighbouring building at 105 High Street. The highlighted ground floor kitchen window and first floor bedroom window were assessed for outlook impact.



Perspective view of 107 and 105 High Street buildings



105 High Street - Floor Plans

Key:



Existing condition of opening suffering minor transgression



First floor window outlook - not impacted

JUSTIFICATION

REAR EXTENSION

The adjacent is an email received by the Applicant from Mr Richard Pocock- Chartered Surveyor and Director of Desbruslais. It is a statement of preference of the original scheme over the amended and approved one.

From: SIMON DOUGALL <simon.dougall@btinternet.com>
Date: 3 March 2023 at 18:16:11 GMT
To: simon.dougall@btinternet.com
Subject: Fwd: Re: Marlow House - Rear Elevation As Proposed

----- Original Message -----

From: "Richard Pocock" <richard@desbruslais.co.uk>
To: "SIMON DOUGALL" <simon.dougall@btinternet.com>; "Rob Harrington" <rh@gouldbaxter.co.uk>
Sent: Friday, 3 Mar, 23 At 17:45
Subject: Re: Marlow House - Rear Elevation As Proposed

Following receipt of the drawings I have amended my comments to the below:

My view of the need to have a gable terminal replacing the upper central rear facings is that, whilst it could be considered complementary to the gable terminal of the existing 19th century rear addition adjacent, its size and form pulls the eye centrally away from the 19th century gable unnecessarily. It is modularly too large and also exceeds the height of the 19th century rear addition - which starts to concern one over the hierarchy and dominance of the suggested gable design. The original design, as submitted for planning, has none of these issues and there is clearly no suggestion of the modern elements exerting dominance, or drawing the eye. They are set down from the gable end of the 19th century rear addition and allow the eye to focus upon the older elements, without detracting from them. The design submitted for planning is discrete and allows the historic rear elements to maintain and exert themselves as required. This is good heritage development practice.

The addition of a gable in this instance is a step backwards and detrimental to both the modern design of the extension and, more importantly, it is to the detriment of the historic elements of the rear of the building - something that this whole process has sought to avoid!

-R

Email from Mr Richard Pocock, Chartered Surveyor and Director of Desbruslais

JUSTIFICATION
REAR EXTENSION

Several letters of support from Applicant’s neighbours were received at the time of the original application submission. Acceptance and support were expressed by residents of neighbouring sites. Attached letters are from residents of properties to the North (109 High Street), South (105 High Street), and West (Warren Croft, house next to the driveway) of the site.

Susan Dubberley From: Sent: To: Subject: John Higgins 02 April 2023 18:23 Susan Dubberley Comments on Planning Application DM/22/3694 Application No DM/22/3694 Marlow House, 107 High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath. We originally responded to this Planning Application, on 10th January 2023, and we were pleased to voice our full and unreserved support for the proposals as submitted. We were delighted that this historically important house was, - after quite some years of neglect, - about to be sensitively and carefully restored. We were impressed by the determination of its new owners, to use the materials and techniques wholly appropriate to a Listed building of significant age, and delighted that its High Street frontage, would be properly restored,- despite the significant work and cost, - enabling Marlow House to positively contribute the appearance of Lindfield. Just as importantly, - having read all the background documents and plans in some detail - we felt that the balance between the preservation and restoration of Marlow House, - to protect and sustain its character in Lindfield's High Street, - when coupled with the contrasting, and exciting scheme for the new extension to the rear of the property, - with space for modern living, and a design and amenities suitable for up-coming generations, had been achieved with great sensitivity and style, and without overdeveloping the site. <i>Whilst we still fully support this Application, and applaud the new owners for their inclusive and consultative approach to the restoration and updating of Marlow House, we are hugely disappointed to now see within the revised plans, the inclusion of the bedroom at first floor level, in the rear south-west corner, as shown in Plan PL06B - dated</i> 1	21/03/2023 (Marlow House Rear Extension as Proposed) We feel that the inclusion of this existing section of Marlow House, and particularly its window, substantially detracts from the design integrity,uniformity, and visual appeal of the Rear Elevation, as originally proposed. We feel that these changes will add nothing of real value to the historic context of Marlow House when compared to the significant restoration to the main elements of the building, and that the original submitted Design for this Elevation (PL 06 dated 05/12/2022 and now superseded) was substantially better in all respects. A great opportunity missed, we believe!! Everyndens, 109 High Street, Lindfield, West Sussex, RH16 2HR 2
--	---

Letter of support from residents of 109 High Street



From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 14 January 2023 08:18
To: Susan Dubberley
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application DM/22/3694

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 14/01/2023 8:18 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	Marlow House 107 High Street Lindfield Haywards Heath West Sussex RH16 2HR
Proposal:	Demolition of the modern two-storey rear extension and demolition of the modern conservatory addition. Construction of a new, two-storey extension to the rear elevation. Alterations to Bakehouse structure to include reduced floor level, removal of mezzanine floor level, re-roofing works and internal insulation. Various works to the listed building to include roof and chimney repairs, window and door replacement, replacement of building services (mechanical and electrical) to include the installation of new sanitary accommodation. Demolition of partially-built three-bay garage and construction of new detached garage building. Associated hard and soft landscaping works, to include new timber gates and brick wall to driveway entrance, new permeable driveway surfacing and new planting.
Case Officer:	Susan Dubberley

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Warrens croft Hickmans lane Lindfield
----------	---------------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	

Kind regards

Letter of support from residents of 105 High Street

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 16 January 2023 20:40
To: Susan Dubberley
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application DM/22/3694

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 16/01/2023 8:40 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Marlow House 107 High Street Lindfield Haywards Heath West Sussex RH16 2HR
Proposal:	Demolition of the modern two-storey rear extension and demolition of the modern conservatory addition. Construction of a new, two-storey extension to the rear elevation. Alterations to Bakehouse structure to include reduced floor level, removal of mezzanine floor level, re-roofing works and internal insulation. Various works to the listed building to include roof and chimney repairs, window and door replacement, replacement of building services (mechanical and electrical) to include the installation of new sanitary accommodation. Demolition of partially-built three-bay garage and construction of new detached garage building. Associated hard and soft landscaping works, to include new timber gates and brick wall to driveway entrance, new permeable driveway surfacing and new planting.
Case Officer:	Susan Dubberley

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	Limes Cottage 105 High Street Lindfield
----------	---

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	We support the planning application for 107 High Street. The new owners have actively shared the plans with us and have frequently been in touch. We believe the proposal to significantly and sympathetically enhance the property and benefit the local area. We wish them all the best with the works.

Letter of support from residents of 105 High Street



JUSTIFICATION
REAR EXTENSION

The original scheme received significant support from neighbours and Lindfield Society.

The Lindfield Society is a community-focused organisation established in 1961. They work with Parish Councils and other local and national bodies to scrutinize planning applications and support residents affected by planning decisions. Their goal is to protect Lindfield’s character and sense of community and to preserve Lindfield’s charm and heritage for future generations.

From: Gil Kennedy <kennedy.gil@gmail.com>
Date: 19 January 2023 at 16:42:45 GMT
To: SIMON DOUGALL <simon.dougall@btinternet.com>
Subject: Re: Marlow House 107 High Street

Dear Simon,

Thanks once again for your invitation and a very interesting overview of your project. When we make representations to the district council, we always present a detailed, reasoned case. We confine these submissions to cases in which we object. Were we to take the same approach to applications we favour, we would in fairness have to do this for each and every one. I hope you'll understand that as a group of volunteers, we just don't have the resources to do this.

We think you've made a strong application that would produce a very welcome restoration of an historic house. Given the serious approach of your architects, I'm sure that you'll be able to arrive at agreement with the council on details of the heritage aspect.

The Society does make conservation and design awards at our AGM each April. These are meant to recognise owners, architects and builders who preserve and enhance the character of our built environment. I hope that in due course your ambitious project will be a candidate for one of these awards.

Good luck with the work and best regards,

Gil

Correspondence with Chairman of Lindfield Preservation Society



JUSTIFICATION
FLAT ROOF EXTENSION


The new rear extension includes a flat roof extension above the bathroom at the northern end of the first-floor plan. Clad in the same timber panels as the main rear extension, the dormer stands out clearly from the existing building. This deliberate contrast emphasizes the new construction rather than attempting to blend it with the historic fabric, which is considered the appropriate design approach.

The approved scheme proposed the roof above the bathroom to be pitched, following the angle of the bake house roof. This would result in diluted significance of the bake house roof. In the contrary, the ‘as-built’ roof infill frames the roof of the bake house and allows it to clearly stand out.


As demonstrated on the adjacent section drawing, the approved scheme pitched roof above bathroom offers limited floor to ceiling height, making the space unusable. The minimum practical height at the lowest point (where the roof meets the wall) is typically around 1.5 meters. The flat roof solution mitigates this issue and improves the quality of space in a sensitive design manner.

Furthermore, when overlaid with the pre-construction rear elevation roofline, the implemented flat roof extension appears modest in size.


- KEY:
- 1. Flat roof extension above bathroom
 -  Area of deviation
 -  Pre-construction rear extension roof line




1. Approved rear elevation - submitted drawings under application DM/22/3694 & DM/22/3695 (planning approved).



3. Proposed rear elevation - constructed in broad accordance with the originally submitted drawings under application DM/22/3694 & DM/22/3695. Proposed to remain as constructed.



2. Approved unusable first floor bathroom - section



4. ‘As-built’ first floor bathroom - section



JUSTIFICATION

GABLED OUTRIGGER & GOTHIC STYLE WINDOW

It is proposed under this application for the 1830s gabled outrigger to be internalised but exposed as an internal brick wall at first floor level with gothic style casement revealed in situ. This way, while concealed externally behind wall of the new extension, the reference to the historic gable is internally emphasised.

As presented on the adjacent photograph of the living room, the rear wall of the original 15th century elements of the dwelling is internalised. By following this design language, internalisation of the historic gable wall and gothic style window is in fact in accordance with the design language already present in the house.

The brickwork outrigger forms part of the original building fabric. The window opening is original to the 1830s wing but the external joinery is likely to be of mid-20th century origin and not of any intrinsic heritage value.

It was also noted by Richard Pocock - Chartered Building Surveyor, Heritage Consultant and the Director of Desbruslais that: *‘The window can be looked at in more detail, but it is not likely to be of significant heritage value. It is not contemporary with the wing.’*


(refer to ‘Relevant Correspondence chapter in ‘Appendices’ section at the end of this document).



Photograph of the historic rear facade seen from the living room of the ‘as built’ ground floor extension




Photograph of the historic rear extension gable with gothic window




Pre-construction photograph - gothic window, view from bedroom




Photograph of the gothic window retained but hidden behind internal wall (wall under construction)



First Floor Plan, Scale 1:100



Internal Elevation 1, Scale 1:50



Internal Elevation 2, Scale 1:50

KEY:



Existing historic outrigger

1.

Existing gothic window

2.

Gothic window fixed shut, exposed internally

JUSTIFICATION

BAKE HOUSE RECONSTRUCTION

The following comments regarding bake house were received from the Conservation Officer:

*‘The early 19th century bakehouse, originally detached but now linked to the house via the existing ground floor additions, is also considered as significant to the narrative of the building. Although retaining little in the way of internal features of interest, its form (as an originally detached outbuilding), and external character, although altered, remain clearly discernible. The Heritage Statement again appears to raise concerns regarding the impact of the proposals on this part of the building *, with which I would agree. The significant loss of fabric from the side and rear elevations with the proposed introduction of large window openings will detract from its character, as would the scale and design of the proposed fenestration. This aspect of the proposal is also therefore considered unacceptable.’*

During strip out works in 2023 the historic bake house collapsed and only its northern wall remained. Adjacent photographs from Applicant’s private collection present the bake house externally supported before its fall.

The building has been re-constructed with high quality materials. No planning application or listed building consent was sought. Its current design resembles the original bake house with approved changes to its openings, however it deviates from the approved drawings slightly.

The historic bake house has been assessed prior to the construction by Desbruslais surveyors, as quoted below: ‘A bakehouse was also added to the rear, of which only the outer walls now remain in situ. No internal features remain, and the interior linings and fixtures are wholly modern. Rear fenestration is also modern in this part of the building.’

Extract from ‘Statement of Heritage Significance’ prepared by Desbruslais, Rev. 1.0: 13th December 2022.

It is noted that the historic fabric was limited.

* Extract from the supporting Heritage Statement prepared by Desbruslais for reference:

‘Whilst the bakehouse is perhaps not the most aesthetic of buildings, its associative value is reasonable and in context with the surrounding village setting and the semi-commercial context of the immediate area and the subject building’s development, then its value could be considered to rise – notwithstanding the lack of any internal elements surviving. [...] Furthermore, the design as it stands, does not seek to particularly differentiate the Bake House element and subsumes what is left of it into the whole. The Bake House has been a semi-detached unit since built and the present rear extension still denotes this separation and allows one to appreciate it as a structure. This presently would be lost within the feasibility design.’

MATERIALS

The bake house was reconstructed using Hamsey Mixed Stock brickwork (refer to Appendices for product data sheet) - the same brickwork type used for the rear extension. The few salvaged bricks from the original building were used internally on the fireplaces.

It was proposed by Gould Baxter Architects proposal, and approved at planning, for the bake house roof tiles to be replaced with ‘plain clay tiles to match existing’. This was achieved in the rebuild.



Bake house falling down during strip-out.
Photograph provided by the Applicant.



Bake house falling down during strip-out.
Photograph provided by the Applicant.



Bake house falling down during strip-out.
Photograph provided by the Applicant.



Bake house after its collapse during strip-out.
Photograph provided by the Applicant.

JUSTIFICATION

BAKE HOUSE RECONSTRUCTION

Part of the proposals of the approved scheme was ‘*retention of the existing Bakehouse building, with internal alterations to remove the existing ground floor partitions and mezzanine floor. The ground floor level of the Bakehouse is to be reduced to match the proposed rear extension, and the roof tiles stripped off to allow them to be re-laid with new membrane and insulation applied. Pair of conservation roof windows to be inserted within the south-facing pitched roof slope*’.

To achieve the new lower floor level the existing walls had to be extended downwards to meet the ground level, specified for construction to be of reclaimed brickwork. This required an intrusive construction work increasing the risk of wall collapsing.

- KEY:
- Previous bake house floor level
 - - Proposed bake house floor level
 - Proposed new reclaimed brickwork wall



1. Rear elevation of the building prior to any works.

2. Approved rear elevation - submitted drawings under application DM/22/3694 & DM/22/3695 (planning approved).

3. Proposed rear elevation



JUSTIFICATION

BAKE HOUSE RECONSTRUCTION

The adjacent image is a fragment of the Bill of Quantities dated 04th of September 2023 provided by Gould Baxter Architects as part of the tender package. The scope of work confirms partial removal of bakehouse walls and introduction of new brickwork.

	Bakehouse walls (G11 Snug)					
6.11	To Bakehouse, allow to remove external walls where indicated and form new solid brick walls to west and south elevations.					
	a) Allow to prop Bakehouse roof as required.	1	Item		350.00	
	b) West elevation – remove brickwork from line of chimney stack to corner and rebuild solid external wall with lime mortar to suit proposed elevation. Tooth in new brickwork to existing. For pricing purposes allow £700 + VAT per pack of bricks – 3m2.	3	M2		1,140.00	
	c) South elevation - remove brickwork from full elevation and rebuild solid external wall with lime mortar to suit proposed elevation. For pricing purposes allow £700 + VAT per pack of bricks – 4.5m2	4.5	M2		1,710.00	

Fragment of the Bill of Quantities dated 04th of September 2023 provided by Gould Baxter Architects as part of the tender package

Just like the brickwork of the original bake house, the Hamsey Mixed Stock brickwork used for re-construction of the bake house is mixed-colour. The adjacent images serve as a comparison of brickwork.



Comparison of brickwork used on the original (left) and re-constructed (right) bake house.



JUSTIFICATION

BAKE HOUSE RECONSTRUCTION

In addition to the previous and historic approval for the rebuilding of the bake house, poor structural condition of the bake house was recorded by McCarey Simmonds Structural Engineers prior to commencement of works.

As presented on the document attached, the risk of the bake house collapsing was assessed and deemed to be of high level during works to it.



Photograph provided by Gina Nichols- previous owner.

Condition of Bakehouse around 1990 - damaged brickwork and holes in the walls, partially demolished chimney stack and missing chimney pot. The photograph demonstrates historically poor condition of the building.



Photograph of the South wall of the original bake house shows sand and cement mortar and partially painted black brickwork not suitable for reuse.

Job Title: Marlow House, High Street, Lindfield			
Job No.: MS06470	Date: Sept 2023	Prepared by: SA	Checked: DS

The following definitions apply:

Hazards	The potential to cause harm.
Risk	The likelihood that harm will occur.
1st Entry	Refers to 'likely severity of harm'
	High - Fatality, major injury or illness causing long term disability.
	Medium – Injury or illness causing short term disability.
	Low - Other injury or illness.
2nd Entry	Refers to 'likelihood that harm will occur'
	High - Certain or near certain to occur.
	Medium – Reasonably likely to occur.
	Low - Very Seldom or never occurs.

CONSTRUCTION METHODS	Risk	Precautions or Actions	Residual Risk
Risk of collapse of existing Bake House (Snug) roof.	H/H	Existing roof to have adequate temporary support with suitable bracing to provide stability in both orthogonal directions. Existing rafters to be robustly tied/fixed to new structure. New masonry to be fully bonded into existing.	H/M
Damage and reduced capacity to existing 152 x 152 UC columns from site welding to thin gauge web and flanges.	H/H	Site welding to be undertaken only with approval of Engineer. Provide bolted and site-drilled connections only.	H/L
Movement or collapse of existing 152 x 152 UC columns due to poor seating/bearing.	H/H	Base of existing columns to be exposed before loaded by new structure. Ensure robust seating onto existing basement walls or provide remedial works to Engineer's approval.	H/L
Risk of collapse of existing first floor and roof area over Kitchen during installation of steel frame.	H/H	Existing walls and floor to have adequate temporary support with suitable bracing to provide stability in both orthogonal directions. Walls to be needled above first floor, design of temporary works by Contractor.	H/L
General stability of new ground floor steel frame.	H/M	Frame to be fully lined, levelled and grouted, along with being fully integrated into ground floor masonry with frame cramps, before works continue above first floor.	H/L



JUSTIFICATION
BAKE HOUSE RECONSTRUCTION

The adjacent image is an email from McCarey Simmonds Structural Engineers received by the Applicant on the 16th of August 2023 regarding the poor condition of the bake house. It was reported that one of the walls was in poor condition and leaning out.

From: david@mccareysimmonds.co.uk <david@mccareysimmonds.co.uk>
Sent: 16 August 2023 16:58
To: 'Michael Doherty' <mjd@gouldbaxter.co.uk>; info@southern-contractors.co.uk
Cc: 'Simon Dougall' <simon.dougall@btinternet.com>; 'Godfrey Baker' <gb@gouldbaxter.co.uk>; 'Rob Harrington' <rh@gouldbaxter.co.uk>; 'Simon Allen' <simon@mccareysimmonds.co.uk>
Subject: Marlow House - Updated foundation layouts

Hi Rob & Mike,

Further to our visit yesterday to review the new trial holes and the existing party wall steelwork which has been under-covered, we confirm the following :

The existing footing depth to the party wall side of the Snug is more shallow than the rear wall and therefore, this wall would need to be underpinned in order to achieve the new lower floor slab level. Note, there looks to be a support pier for the neighbouring building which would need to be considered during the underpinning works. The opposite wall was in a poor condition and leaning out, therefore we discussed replacing this wall & the internal gable wall with new masonry walls on a new strip footings rather than further underpinning, given the wall condition and the proposed new openings to be cut through this wall.

We will review the existing 152 x 152 UC 37 which has been uncovered to assess whether this can be retained and we will await confirmation as to whether the floor / roof structure is to be raised within the Victorian section of the building.


Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any queries.

Kind Regards

Dave

.....
David Simmonds
Director
david@mccareysimmonds.co.uk
McCarey Simmonds Limited
Consulting Civil and Structural Engineers
The Design Studio
94 High Street
Steyning
West Sussex. BN44 3RD
Tel: 01273 808820
Fax: 01903 816496
Mobile: 07721 027701

This E-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and may contain privileged information. It is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you are not the addressee, you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by error. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this E-mail in error please notify the Administrator by E-mail (info@mccareysimmonds.co.uk) or by telephone +44 (0) 01273 808820. Any view expressed in these e-mails is solely the view of the individual named and does not necessarily represent those of McCarey Simmonds.



distribute, disclose
author and do not

Correspondance between Structural Engineer McCarey Simmonds and the Applicant regarding bake house

