

Project Address:	Castle Inn, Hickstead, RH17 5LZ
Proposal:	Erection of outbuildings, internal and external alterations to Grade II Listed building
Prepared for:	Planning
Planning reference:	DM/25/0736 and DM/25/0737
Prepared by:	LM Furness
Project number:	1725
Date:	19.09.2025

Heritage Queries:	
Local authority Request for Information	Response
We now have marked-up elevations to show the various works to the windows across the building, plus detailed elevational and sectional drawings of the new and replacement windows and French doors. Although this information is helpful, we do not have the survey previously requested to give the age, level of interest and condition of the windows affected. The brief letter from S Cornwell is not sufficient in this respect and does not identify specific windows, particularly the surviving historic windows, or discuss their individual conditions in any detail. This will be particularly relevant where windows which may be original are proposed for replacement (e.g. to the north and south elevations of the rear wing of the building). Mr/Ms Cornwell's assessment that 'splicing in bits here and there is not cost effective' does not equate to the conservation (as opposed to cost) led approach which we would expect in the context of historic windows to a listed building. I would also like further detail (a schedule of works) with respect to the proposed repair work to the retained original windows.	Window survey to follow:
Proposal to 'sandblast' the east elevation and repoint with lime mortar: The required justification and further information have not been provided. From the wording of the response document, it would appear that this work may already have taken place? Can the applicant please confirm whether this is the case, and provide the requested supporting information, and details of the method of brick cleaning used. W.r.t. the mortar mix, can the applicant please confirm the type of lime used? If the work is complete, a further site visit may be necessary to examine the impact on the historic brickwork.	The contractor has confirmed that they used a chemical paint stripper to remove the paint. We have provided details of the product used. I agree that a site visit would be very helpful to review the brickwork. We feel that the facing brick would have been exposed originally as it's very unlikely to have been constructed in decorative brickwork, only to be painted over.
New signage: The size, design and materials of the new sign shown to the south elevation are acceptable, but can the applicant please confirm the proposed colours? Can they also please confirm that this single sign is all of the new signage proposed to the building? I.e. that no name sign to the east, road facing elevation of the building (or elsewhere), no menu boards, no directional signage at any point on the building, or any other signage of any kind is proposed, either to the building or free-standing within the gardens or car parking area? This seems somewhat unlikely to me.	For the purposes of this application we are not proposing any further signage. an additional application will be submitted if further signage is needed.
New outbuildings: The proposed facing and roofing materials are acceptable. The sash windows are acceptable. The detail for the door design appears to be missing- we would expect large scale elevational and sectional drawings as for the window detail supplied, although this could be required by condition if preferred.	Drawing previously provided - Drawing. 1725_3.015 Proposed Door Details (Re-attached)
Solar panels: A sectional drawing has been provided which confirms that the panels would not be visible from ground level. This aspect of the proposal is therefore considered acceptable.	No action required.
Internal works: Basement level: A structural report has been provided which explains the extent and nature of the floor strengthening works which have taken place, and gives a brief justification for this. Although these works are extensive and potentially will have been quite invasive, on balance this aspect of the proposal is considered acceptable in this context.	No action required.
Ground floor: Underfloor heating: Typical sectional drawings have been provided showing the underfloor heating fixed as in joist aluminium trays to the underside of the existing floorboards at ground and first floors. Some of these floorboards and the joists on which they rest are original. However, we do not plans or a methodology which explains the full impact of the works, such as any necessary connections between the different elements of the system and how these will be achieved without damage to historic fabric, e.g. drilling through joists. Also, can the applicant please provide evidence that the operation of the heating system will not result in damage, e.g. warping, to the historic floorboards?	Drawing and supporting information updated and attached. 1725_3.019 Proposed Underfloor heating detail rev a
G05 corridor render and matt sealant: The applicant has confirmed that the render which has been removed was not original and is to be replaced with lime render. No sealant is now proposed to the exposed brickwork. This aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious.	No action required.

Heritage Queries:	
Local authority Request for Information	Response
<i>G05 corridor ceilings taken down: The photo mentioned does not seem to have been provided?</i>	Photo attached. (Below).
<i>G06 window: The inconsistency been plans and statement has been resolved.</i>	No action required.
<i>Kitchen roof and floor structure: A structural report and drawings have been provided. The works are again extensive but appear to be justified by the report. The applicant has confirmed that the ceiling structure removed was modern.</i>	No action required.
<i>G09 store: I think it may be a typing error but the response here refers again to the kitchen ceiling rather than to G09 (store room). This should be corrected.</i>	SOW updated and attached.
<i>Stair G13: Although very limited information is provided, and this is hardly the informed consideration as part of a fully detailed Heritage Statement which we would expect for a major intervention of this nature, the response suggests that the staircase was 1980s or earlier and that the replacement stair is in the same position. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, an objection to this work may be hard to sustain.</i>	No action required.
<i>Internal works: Basement level: A structural report has been provided which explains the extent and nature of the floor strengthening works which have taken place, and gives a brief justification for this. Although these works are extensive and potentially will have been quite invasive, on balance this aspect of the proposal is considered acceptable in this context.</i>	No action required.
<i>Ensuites to bedrooms: The response mentions an amended plan but that does not seem to have been included in the package of drawings, or with the later structural information. Did we receive this separately?</i>	Latest plan attached
<i>Bedrooms 1.03 and 1.05: If I am reading the response to this point correctly the openings were not existing, but there was evidence of a historic but infilled opening in at least one position? This needs clarification. If the openings were not existing, even if there was a previously existing but infilled opening in that position, then the existing plans submitted with the application require amendment to reflect this. The evidence of a previous opening referred to should be elaborated on, and its position relative to the new work clarified.</i>	Updated As existing plans attached.
<i>Skirtings and architrave removed: Can the applicant provide the photographs of the previous situation as requested? If only elements of original fabric remained and these have been matched with the new work this is unlikely to prove contentious, but we need evidence to substantiate this.</i>	Photos attached below.
<i>Walls repaired: The details provided are acceptable.</i>	No action required.
<i>Structural works to hall and first floor structure:</i>	No action required.
<i>Again this is covered by the structural report and drawings received. Again, although the works proposed are extensive, they are difficult to resist in the context.</i>	No action required.
<i>Room 1.04 chimney breast: The applicant has confirmed that the intention is to reinstate and appropriate lime-based plaster. This work is not considered contentious.</i>	No action required.
<i>1.07 Bedroom 5.1920s fire surround: We don't appear to have plans to show the position of this fire surround as requested, or to confirm its retention. These should be provided (existing and proposed plans would need amendment).</i>	Updated Plans attached. As proposed and as existing.
<i>Exposed brickwork to hallway: The details of the repair are acceptable, and it is now proposed to re-render the area rather than apply sealant- this is also acceptable.</i>	No action required.

Heritage Queries:	
Local authority Request for Information	Response
<i>Replacement of rafters: The structural information and further detail provided is acceptable in the context.</i>	No action required.
<i>Replacement ceiling: The applicant has confirmed that a modern plaster board ceiling has been removed and will be replaced like-for-like. This is acceptable.</i>	No action required.
<i>ASHP: The response confirms no ASHPs are proposed, in which case the DAS should be amended to reflect this.</i>	DAS updated and re-attached.
<i>Removal of plasterwork and ceilings: The applicant has confirmed that original finishes are to be reinstated, which is acceptable, subject to detail.</i>	No action required.
<i>Bedroom 7 Removal of chimney: The response confirms that this is an error and that the chimney had been removed some time previously. The SoW is to be updated, but I don't think we have received this as yet?</i>	SoW updated and re-attached.
<i>Bedroom 6 Structural works: As above further information received which is acceptable in the context.</i>	No action required.
<i>Room 109 chamfering of joists: The response clarifies that this constitutes the addition of timber fillets above the existing joists to level the existing floorboards. This is not considered contentious, however again the updated SoW has not been not received as yet.</i>	SoW updated and re-attached. (Amendments marked in red)



G.05 - Suspended ceiling.



Torus skirting board - all new to match existing



Existing architrave - all new to match



Existing architrave - all new to match



Torus skirting board - all new to match existing