

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 September 2026 10:31:50 UTC+01:00
To: "Andy Watt" <Andy.Watt@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/26/1460 and 1461 Mulberry Cottage, Old Place, Lindfield

Hi Andy

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.

Mulberry Cottage is a Grade II listed building, part of a group of three attached properties located to the rear of Old Place, a substantial Grade II* listed former manor house, at the northern end of Lindfield High Street. These buildings were apparently constructed c.1908 as the stables block to the house, with staff accommodation at first floor, although the submitted Heritage Statement suggests that there may have been buildings on the site prior to this, which were remodelled or rebuilt. The building was converted to three cottages during the 20th century.

Mulberry Cottage would be considered to possess architectural value based on its design and construction, historical illustrative value as a former ancillary building contributing to the narrative of the wider group associated with Old Place, and aesthetic value. It also has group value with and would be considered to be within the setting of Old Place, and is within the settings of the listed buildings at The Thatched Cottage (II*) and Lindfield House (II*). Mulberry Cottage is located within the Lindfield Conservation Area.

There is a linear range of outbuildings, in use as garages, set against the northern side of the driveway to the north of Mulberry Cottage, which would be regarded as curtilage listed.

The current proposal, which follows on from pre-application advice, is for alterations to the listed building comprising the following external and internal works:

- Addition of a window to the north elevation;
- Replacement of a rooflight to the northern slope with a conservation style rooflight;
- Construction of a new dormer to the northern roofslope;
- Removal of an existing dormer from the southern roofslope to be replaced with a rooflight, and construction of a new dormer in an adjacent position;
- Replacement of modern timber doors to the southern elevation with glazed Crittall style doors and reinstatement of original metal gates;
- Reconfiguration of the internal layout at ground and first floor level;
- Removal of a modern plasterboard ceiling at first floor to expose the roof structure; and
- Installation of roof insulation between the rafters.

It is also proposed to replace the garage doors to the garage building, and to carry out landscaping works to the courtyard to the south of the house, including partial removal of the existing pavements to create a lawned area, and installation of an ASHP.

To consider these works in turn:

- The external works to the house were considered, and amended, at pre-application stage and are now considered on balance acceptable.
- At pre-application stage, it was noted that the alterations to the internal layout of the building are unlikely to be regarded as contentious if it is confirmed that the partitions which it is proposed to remove are 20th century work, and that the original plan form has already been substantially compromised- this is suggested in the submitted Heritage Statement, with reference to an archaeological survey, however the survey itself was not provided. It was recommended that this should be submitted as part of any formal application, but it has not been received. I would suggest that the applicant provide this further information to allow a fully informed assessment of the proposals.
- With respect to the removal of the ceiling at first floor level similar considerations apply- further evidence would be required regarding the date of the ceiling of the rooms in question- I note that the finish is modern plasterboard, but was the ceiling structure itself also inserted at a later stage, or were the rooms originally ceiled? This would not be unexpected if the space was used as staff accommodation, rather than as a hayloft, as the Heritage Statement notes is a possibility. Again, further information is required.
- The introduction of insulation to the roof is not considered contentious in principle, subject to detail. An appropriate, breathable product should be specified.

The landscaping proposed to the rear (southern) side of the property, specifically the removal of part of the hard surfacing in favour of lawn, is considered contentious. The area in question is part of the original hard surfaced courtyard which runs west to east from the northern entrance frontage to the main building of Old Place, through the archway between Archway and Turret Houses (as they are now known), past Mulberry Cottage and on past Sundial Cottage to White Cottage.

This yard is part of the designed layout of the Old Place estate which dates from the remodelling and extension of the original 15th century house by Charles Eamer Kempe during the late 19th and early 20th century- this work included the construction (or substantial rebuilding, see above) of Mulberry Cottage and its attached neighbours as service buildings. Kempe's influence and the physical legacy of his building activities are key components of the narrative and special interest of Old Place, and the surviving legibility of the planned layout of the estate contributes positively to this.

Furthermore, the yard area contributes to an understanding of Mulberry Cottage and its neighbours as service buildings and was associated with their function as stables. In

this context, the removal of part of the apparently original herringbone brick paving in favour of garden planting, is considered contentious. I would recommend that this aspect of the proposal is omitted from the scheme, and the paving retained in tact. It should be noted that the applicant was advised of this at pre-application stage.

I would also request that the applicant clarify whether any works are proposed to the boundaries to the eastern and western ends of the part of the yard forming part of the property?

With respect to the ASHP which is shown located within the rear yard, further information should be provided as to its scale and appearance, as well as to any proposed screening. Given the potential visual prominence of the pump, this should be provided now rather than be requested by condition.

In summary, although aspects of the proposal are considered on balance acceptable, others require removal from the scheme, or further information to allow a fully informed assessment.

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