

From: Rainier, Peter <Peter.Rainier@dmhstallard.com>
Sent: 22 May 2026 12:26:13 UTC+01:00
To: "Susan Dubberley" <Susan.Dubberley@midsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: "Rainier, Peter" <Peter.Rainier@dmhstallard.com>; "Simon Dougall" <simon.dougall@btinternet.com>; "Steve Ashdown" <Steve.Ashdown@midsussex.gov.uk>; "Eric Owens" <eric.owens@midsussex.gov.uk>; "Malin, Lauren" <Lauren.Malin@dmhstallard.com>; "Chris Griffiths" <chris@hcukgroup.co.uk>
Subject: FW: Marlow House DM/25/3131 and 3132 [DMHS-DMS.FID8001034]
Attachments: DM/25/3131 and 3132 Marlow House, High Street, Lindfield

Dear Susan,

Thank you for sending over Emily's comments on the revised application, as agreed. The purpose of the request was to ensure that there were not inaccuracies within the report, whilst acknowledging that we are likely to continue to disagree in respect of the degree of harm and your ultimate officer recommendation. Within the substantive section of the email below, you will find some inaccuracies and also our (this email has been formulated with input from our Heritage consultant, architect, client and myself) views/opinions on the Conservation Officer's response to the application.

Overall, whilst I can understand that the Conservation Officer, given her role and remit, seeks to strenuously protect the heritage of the District, our concern is that the report verges on the vindictive and unfortunately continues to contain numerous inaccuracies with almost no acknowledgement of the proposed benefits.

The opening paragraph is concerning as it would appear that my email of the 14th April which clearly addresses the south east bedroom has not been considered. Also, my email of the 22nd April which went into considerable detail listing all the additional benefits is not acknowledged. These are comprehensive documents in terms of detail, and they should have been considered in the Conservation Officer's report.

Could you ensure that this email is placed on the application file/planning portal. I note that your email (18th May) indicates that you are in the process of writing my report for the Planning Committee on 11th June and requests a further extension of time until 15th June. I can confirm our agreement to the requested EOT.

Condition of the property

The officers claim to have visited the property just prior to works commencing. This is not accurate. Officers did not visit the property until (late January 2023) after the

purchase in early September 2022 by which point significant works and clearance to the property had already taken place. This is clearly documented in various reports submitted to the Council. We also addressed this matter in depth in our email to you on the 6th March.

It is noteworthy that the agent (Jackson Stops) representing the previous owner confirms in his letter of support that the building was in “*Wrack and ruin*” at the time of sale. The building had suffered a long, sustained period of neglect, not just by the previous owners, but the occupiers beforehand too, which included unlawful and unsympathetic works. There has been no acknowledgement to date of this, which is noteworthy.

The Conservation Officer states the property was tired at the point of their inspection. This matters because the property was previously presented to the members as “*tired*”. That characterisation does not reflect the true condition of the property at the point of purchase as proved. Over 30 letters of support have been submitted with this application, including from immediate neighbours who were directly familiar with the property and have put on record just how degraded it was. Their testimony speaks directly to the baseline condition that officers did not witness and that the Members have not been given a complete picture of.

There was no heating in the building as the boilers were condemned by British Gas, it was rat infested, asbestos was present in various areas, The roof leaked in multiple areas, There was damp throughout the building, windows were rotten, electrics were a hazard, making the property a fire risk, there was no insulation, the rendering needed completely repairing and the front elevation was an eyesore in need of complete refurbishment.

Please also note the Desbrulais report as they inspected the property quoting “*Clearly the house is in dire need of intervention before the present condition deteriorates any further*”.

Photographs and statements from various specialists reports clearly confirm the condition was more than tired. It took over five months prior to construction to get the house in the quoted “*tired*” position. If the house was in a tired condition, it would be reasonable to assume that the new owners would have moved in and lived in the property, they did not do so because in their opinion it was uninhabitable.

In my view and that of our Heritage Consultant, the Conservation Officer’s characterisation of the property simply as “*tired*” is an attempt to downplay the need for multiple structural and non-structural interventions to replace modern fabric (blockwork/improvised steel post repairs and non-breathable finishes) to secure the building’s proper conservation. The refusal to accept what the planning officer’s report highlights in the 2023 decision, i.e. that “It is clear that the building has suffered from neglect over the years and the application offers an opportunity for improvements and extensive refurbishment works that will preserve the future of this listed building.” is evidently a strategy to diminish the many positives of the scheme, notably the heritage benefits resulting from 60% of the timber framed construction being revealed/restored and breathable lime based finishes reinstated.

We consider the Conservation Officer's position and approach to be unreasonable in that regard.

17th Century Staircase

Firstly, the ground to first floor was as recorded by Desbrulais as *"Heavily butchered and modern timber"* This is being replaced in reclaimed oak. Surely this will replicate a staircase of this age rather than modern timber. Furthermore, as part of this proposal the Basement access door is being replaced in reclaimed oak rather than modern plywood. As clearly confirmed in Heritage reports the previous materials were modern and butchered. Even if the staircase had been kept, the works would have to of been implemented due to their poor condition as recorded in photographs. The hatch to the first floor is a benefit as it wasn't present at the time of purchase.

We fail to understand the Conservation Officer's objection to a proposal which essentially does everything that an enforcement notice would require, i.e. put the staircase back as it was, only with heritage enhancements in the form of the lower flight constructed in seasoned oak and access to the first floor and attic (which is grudgingly conceded to be a benefit). The proposition the Conservation Officer is putting forward appears to us to be paradoxical. The original staircase cannot be magicked back into position, and that appears to be the only solution she will accept. In reality, the best that can be done is what is now proposed. A measure of pragmatism needs to be introduced, not an obstructive idealism bordering on zealotry. The unauthorised removal has occurred. What is being proposed will make good, indeed enhance where this is possible, and hence should be supported. The Conservation Officer is relying on the fact that an unauthorised change has occurred to block a perfectly legitimate solution. What is not acceptable here is the Conservation Officer's insistence that – *"the appropriate mechanism for this is in my opinion therefore through the enforcement process, which does not carry with it the implication that the Council considers such loss of fabric acceptable."* Since she agrees that the reinstatement would to some extent be conjectural, a future enforcement notice would also need to be backed up by a Listed Building Consent for an acceptable staircase design. Therefore, why not do that as part of this application? This is rather telling, and a tacit admission that if the replacement staircase as now proposed were accepted, it gives the Conservation Officer less wiggle room in coming to an overall finding of harm when considering the scheme as a whole.

This is an award winning house thanks to the highly skilled tradesman the owner has commissioned to undertake all of the sensitive restoration works, so the replacement stair will be reinstated with the same artisan and crafted approach.

First floor to Attic

We have confirmed the salvageable sections of the staircase are at WSAT Ltd. We have previously stated that they can be inspected, but the Council Officers has never taken up the offer. The salvageable sections will be incorporated in the rebuilt

staircase. The attic hatch was not in existence, so the introduction of this element is an obvious benefit.

The Conservation Officer in one sentence confirms this is a limited heritage benefit but states this is outweighed by the loss of historic fabric. As confirmed the staircase at ground floor level was of modern materials and the staircase from first floor to attic will be reinstated using a percentage of historic material. In summary there is only a small loss of historic material. The plus is the staircase is being reinstated in reclaimed oak throughout and will replicate the original staircase far more strongly, with the additional benefit of access hatches at first floor level and attic level.

We still confirm that we understood that the planning approval and drawings confirmed the removal of the first floor staircase. If there was any ambiguity surrounding this element of works the LPA should have used their powers to stipulate a condition that called for additional information to be submitted relating to these works, to ensure they were comfortable with their duty of care to a Listed Building. We would also confirm that there were only two meetings with the Conservation Officer twice before the original application. As witnessed and recorded in emails by Rob Harrington and Godfrey Baker of Gould Baxter. The applicant maintains that the Conservation Officer confirmed the lower staircase could be removed at the site meeting of the 23rd Jan. It was also acknowledged by Desbrulais Heritage specialists that the loss of the lower staircase would be acceptable as it was from modern material. It was never discussed at length as the Conservation Officer continues to assert.

Notwithstanding the above, the Conservation Officer may say that any comments were made on site without prejudice and ultimately point to the approved drawings which show the staircase being retained. The Conservation Officer obviously feels very strongly about this, consequently in our view this should lead to support for the reinstatement of the staircase as now proposed.

The Conservation Officer asserts that *"Historic England continue to object to this aspect of the proposal."* What HE actually state is *"The proposal would mitigate some of the harm caused by the staircase's demolition, but there would still be a loss of 17th-century fabric and, due to the omission of the first-floor enclosure, a reduced ability to appreciate its historic form"* That is not an objection and clearly they would support an authentic reinstatement using improved timber and the benefit of vertical access as part of the planning application. If necessary, conditions could be imposed to provide added control.

Partition Ground floor reception

It has been confirmed on numerous occasions that the infill panels have planning approval to be removed. Please refer to approved drawing no GH342 PL02 POINT 14A confirms "removal of infill panels.

This is evidence that our documents have not been read and digested. It appears at the Conservation Officer may think she knows the content of our documents based on previous submissions, and forms an improper and prejudicial opinion, without

proper review of the additional evidence presented. See P135 of the submitted DAS.

South-east Bedroom

It would appear that the Conservation Officer has not read my previous email 14th April.

- 1) We have clearly pointed out why we are not amending the Vaulted Ceiling as approval has been granted in planning documents 12/05/23
- 2) The ceiling finishes were proved to be artex and plasterboard which are modern and the approved drawings confirm these can be removed GH342 PLO7 B POINT 27. The joists and floorboards were removed as we have permission to create a Vaulted Ceiling
- 3) We have clearly confirmed that the Rafters are from reclaimed oak and not taken from the house. Please see my email to you on the 14th April which previously confirmed this point.
- 4) This has been addressed in the updated DAS following the previous round of comments.
- 5) New pictures provide on P167 of the DAS - this has been addressed in the updated DAS following the previous round of comments.
- 6) Again the floorboards are not part of the Timber frame - this has already been addressed in my 14th April email. The floorboards provide a degree of structural rigidity as a 'membrane' but are not part of the load bearing structure. Seasoned oak floorboards are nonetheless proposed to be reinstated.
- 7) Permission was granted to implement a vaulted ceiling as described within applications DM/22/3694 & DM/22/3695.

Please also note in the Gould Baxter report it states many joists will need replacing due to rot and/or woodworm damage.

If there was any ambiguity surrounding these works the LPA could have sought clarification or imposed conditions to require additional details to be submitted.

Partition between north bedroom and dressing room

We would request that this benefit (accepted as such by the Conservation Officer) should be agreed as a heritage benefit which did not form part of the approved scheme.

17th Century Floorboards this should be attic not first floor.

Firstly, the boards will not be manufactured by a local supplier but will be from sourced reclaimed oak by the Heritage specialist and thus closely match the originals

Again, as confirmed by Gould Baxter re the attic *"It is also likely that flooring will need to be supplemented with new where existing boards are found to be in a poor condition and not suitable for reinstatement"* They also confirm the previous owner

confirmed that many of the attic boards had been repurposed. In summary as proved in reports and photographs a high percentage of attic floorboards were either relocated by the previous owner or were not fit for purpose. Works were undertaken by the applicant, but they are not responsible for the entire area, this in fact is a very misleading statement as again proved in photographs and reports. Please see page 167 DAS which illustrates the condition of the attic floorboards.

Attic Access Hatch

The applicant will be requesting the Heritage craftsman to supply the Access Hatch floorboards from reclaimed oak. Note the hatch was not in existence when the applicant purchased the house. This is a point of significance. The hatch (presuming it was there, as no evidence has been found of its existence that we are aware of) and therefore the presence of a hatch has to a degree been assumed. As such, if one was present and has been removed, then it was unlawful, and this proposed work is a Heritage benefit. However, this argument is the same argument as the stair re-instatement in so much as if it was removed it is now being sympathetically re-instated.

The Conservation Officer seems to suggest leaving the hatch open which is concerning, is she not aware of Historic England's recommendations? There would be no way in which the attic hatch being left open could be enforced. This is a frankly absurd suggestion and another example of Conservation Officer over stepping the mark.

From a Fire Safety point of view an open hatch will allow a fire to spread more quickly.

Energy Efficiency, please note heat rises so an open hatch allows warm air to escape and increases heat loss.

In Summer it can let hot air circulate down making cooling harder.

Cold air infiltration can lead to condensation in the attic which over time may damage the oak frame and plaster especially in a listed building.

In Summary an attic hatch open is not only unenforceable but both unsafe and inefficient in a Listed Building. It could accelerate the deterioration of Historic Materials. Closing and insulating the hatch is the recommended approach.

Crucially, Historic England recommends insulating and draught proofing hatches while keeping them closed when not in use.

See 'Historic England Energy Efficiency in Historic Buildings' and also their Access and Safety statement.

Bake House

As set out previously, the bakehouse collapsed and was not demolished as the Conservation Officer keeps stating. It has been rebuilt to the exact same dimensions. The only fabric lost are bricks and nothing else.

Note Andrew Parkers letter is relevant as he confirms the building is unsafe and should be rebuilt. It was also stated in the DAS that the walls had to be extended down to meet the ground floor level which added further risk to the stability of the

building. Andrew Parker states a survey has been carried out and that with the proposed new loadings the building would be at risk. This report was in 1999 and demonstrated by photographic evidence, no further structural changes have taken place until our works. Hence his structural statement does carry significant weight.

Mc Carey Simmons qualified structural engineers provide a Hazard Inventory confirming the risks, they also clearly record in their email of the 16th August 2023 that the south and west walls should be taken down as they are leaning badly.

The above points clearly demonstrate the structural condition of the Bakehouse. These are statements from Structural Engineers that support the reason why the incident occurred. We never realised the Bakehouse would collapse. We acknowledged the concerns of the specialists and as recorded in photographs the builder took all necessary precautions during construction. It collapsed as recorded so we had no other option other than to rebuild like for like. It was, as recorded, never in the scope of works to rebuild the Bakehouse.

The north and part of the south wall are still original.

The South 4.5 m2 and West 3m2 walls are replaced with bricks that have been approved in planning for areas of the Bakehouse (see earlier condition 3 - DM/22/3694). Please also refer to photographs in the DAS of the condition of the bricks. The salvageable ones have been used in the fireplaces.

It also confirms on Drawing G342 PLO6 & 7 point B Bakehouse walls to be rebuilt with matching rear extension point 1.

No concession on the removal of the rooflights from the Bakehouse roof as a heritage benefit. This is another omission.

To paraphrase the Desbruslais report; the proposal does not seek to differentiate the Bake House element but subsumes what is left of it into the whole. The Bake House has been a semi-detached unit for decades (The Bakehouse became semi-detached in 1987. Planning document LF/064/87 confirms this point. It is illustrated on Page 18 of the DAS) and the present rear extension still denotes this separation and allows for it to be appreciated as a structure.

Internalised window first floor

The proposed window will be visible and prove a feature especially in the evening when lit, as similarly approved with the format downstairs.

We were very surprised that the Conservation Officer originally indicated that the Gothic window was original and should be saved at all costs. In the 2023 planning approval the Conservation Officer confirms it is an Original Window.

Whether the window is internalised or not, replacing it, which is acknowledged as being "*truer to the original nature of this window*" - is a benefit and should be confirmed as such. As communicated in the revised and submitted DAS, there is no visible public benefit to exposing or internalising this window - it is not visible from the public domain, so revealing it is largely an academic exercise.

Loft Insulation

It is a benefit and so should be acknowledged and given due consideration.

Services

When upgrading a listed building pipework has to be upgraded. The majority of original routes were followed where possible. The original boiler and water tank were in the attic so a level of practicality must be allowed. The majority was replaced like for like.

Please read page 198 DAS as the pipes are clipped to joists and not notched as suggested, thus avoiding any loss of fabric. This is further evidence of a disproportionate assessment of impact on the building's significance. The proposal is very much consistent with the heritage asset's proper conservation and the building has to be lived in by real people. It is a home, not a museum.

On other Listed Buildings, other authorities have implemented conditions requested specific and further information relating to services. I would therefore default to an earlier argument: if there was any ambiguity surrounding this element of works in the approved drawings following revisions during the application process, the LPA should have used their powers to issue a conditional approval, issuing a condition that called for additional information to be submitted relating to these works, to ensure they were comfortable with their duty of care to a Listed Building.

The rear gable

The Victorian Gable still exists and the incorporation of a sash window will enhance its authenticity. Nothing is lost as it will be exposed as an internal feature. If anything with the introduction of an authentic window it will replicate a true Victorian gable rather than one with a 'gothic' replica. This will surely portray a more realistic interpretation of the phases of construction. The building's historic narrative remains legible and can be appreciated, albeit largely as part of an internal inspection of the building. We acknowledge a degree of harm resulting from the masking of the new extension from an external perspective, but it is a low level of harm and does not affect the building's core significance which is the 15th century timber framed hall house. The latter is now more visible to the rear elevation than it used to be. The officer's argument is flawed. The officer claims that "*The special interest of the listed building, [...] is derived in part from its evolution over many centuries*" If a building's value is derived from adaptations over many centuries, then the modern additions have to be considered too, as they are a reflection of the socio-culture of the times within which we live, and therefore form part of the narrative and special interest of the building.

Noting the Officers statement. One must question how anyone ever read the different phases in fabric and layout with the previously approved conservatories and mismatch of buildings. The 2023 Officer's Report acknowledges that the replacement rear extension as approved provides a more cohesive rear elevation compared to the ad hoc previous mis match of buildings which were detrimental to the listed building. Furthermore, it was accepted that the contrasting modern style of the extension would result in an improvement to the character and appearance of the Listed Building (page 11 of the Approved Delegated Report on the 12/05/23). The previous arrangement also obscured all of the 16th century house, which is

now revealed in views from further away towards the back of the garden, with rooflights removed from this roof. This compensates to some extent for encapsulating the Georgian outshot. In fact, the Disbursals Heritage specialist commend the rear extension in their Heritage Statement (point 12.5 page 30).

The Conservation Officer's comment, *"As noted above, one would be hard pushed to realise that Marlow House was a historic building at all, let alone a listed one in a Conservation Area"* is not credible.

Works at Basement level

Again, note Historic England supports the use of breathable Lime renders as they are appropriate for the protection of old masonry and the long term preservation. Lime render is reversible and compatible, so the original fabric is not permanently lost. There is no harm arising from this work. There is preservation in situ, no loss of fabric, it is reversible, and it is also good conservation practice.

We respect the historic wall but with the actions taken it protects the house from rising damp and long term moisture damage

The Conservation Officer also insisted the joists in the cellar were original. As now proved in the Desbrelais statement these were modern timber. Gould Baxter also confirmed this in their report.

It has been confirmed the works in the Basement are in accordance with good practice by a Heritage specialist. If we take the lime render off the walls this will affect the performance of the condition of the Basement. This area of the house was very damp and is now dry due to the method of materials used.

W.C at ground floor

The Conservation Officer never offered the opportunity to put a W.C anywhere downstairs. Gould Baxter will confirm this as our agents at the planning stage. Her statement at the time was no to a downstairs toilet. The location of the downstairs WC is not problematic in heritage terms for the reasons set out in the heritage statement. The adjoining study was originally sub-divided and the long narrow room that was here previously exhibited no historic timber framing as I understand it. The new layout allows for the historic construction and presence of historic partitions to be read alongside new ones which enclose the cloakroom WC and are constructed in sympathy with the 16th century house. No harm results on account of this change.

The wall in question was formed of Breeze blocks and one section of modern clad stone nogging panel and not old stonework as the Conservation Officer suggests. This was not a historic partition wall. Its removal, regardless of the presence of cosmetic stone cladding (introduced when it was a restaurant as a conceit) is a heritage benefit in my view insofar as it reveals actual historic timber framed construction now that it has gone and removes an element that was muddling the historic plan form. One of the original reasons the request was declined is that the

Conservation Officer stated the stone noggin panel was in fact original stonework. This was in fact far from the truth as confirmed in the letter of support from Chimney House. The Indian restaurateurs built the breeze block wall and introduced the stone noggin panel in the late 1980's to this area.

Chimney breasts.

The historic nature of the chimney breast was already completely disguised. The new brick facing is a contemporary finish overcladding the historic fabric, as I understand, and is potentially reversible. Compared to what was there before I don't consider the impact to be harmful.

At first floor level the original brickwork remains exposed, there is a new oak mantel shelf and new reclaimed brickwork to the overmantel, which reinforces the presence of the chimney breast.

The fireplace downstairs as recorded in photographs was not traditionally proportioned as the Conservation Officer states but unusable as confirmed by the chimney specialist.

The chimney stack is still a prominent feature throughout the house, it is a large volume of masonry which is partly revealed in the entrance hall and very much a part of the plan form as one moves around it. The works were undertaken in good faith as an enhancement to an already badly altered feature. No historic fabric was removed or damaged

Subdivision of central room

If you refer to the original drawing confirming the previously present door it also confirms the layout of the first floor and subdivision of the adjacent room to be the same.

The door is relevant as the Conservation Officer doubted one was ever present. Hence the request from her for justification of opening up the doorway. This was proved originally with the evidence of the hinge and more recently the drawing dated LF/083/96. If you look at this drawing it clearly confirms the layout of the first floor before any extension work took place. In fact, there is no entrance to the northern bedroom at this time. This is justification of the original layout. It does confirm a sub-division existed in 1996 as this was then the lobby. There is physical evidence on the oak frame that an opening existed between what is now the dressing room and bedroom, as communicated in the DAS on P149. Furthermore, the dressing room represents a restrained and considered intervention, balancing functional requirements with the preservation and subtle expression of the historic timber framework, contributing positively to the building's heritage significance.

The re-opened doorway is self-evidently historic/original to a time well before the building was listed. An objective reading of the plans would have to concede this is a beneficial change in heritage terms.

Overlaying floorboards

Firstly, please read the Listed floor specialists report. Why would the applicant go to this expense if the existing floorboards could be used. We have offered on numerous occasions to lift the boards and prove the original boards still exist. This has never been taken up.

Most floorboards were not viewable (as confirmed by Gould Baxter) or fit for purpose, we elected under specialist advice to overlay them. Our specialist in this field has over thirty five years of experience and is alarmed by the Conservation Officers comments. See page 187 of the DAS where the Historic floor specialist report confirms *“due to the degree of Historical deterioration and damage the floor was beyond repair and refurbishment”*.

Gould Baxter’s statement is floorboards were in good condition where visible. As most of the flooring was concealed with carpet and other hoarded material the true extent was only apparent when fully exposed. The overlaid oak flooring, which is of a very high quality, also preserves the original floorboards in situ

Infilling of Windows

Historic England’s objection to this (if made in light of the evidence presented) is untenable. The historic plans from 80s and 90s prove there were no windows in this elevation prior to 1997 (see Appendix 3 of the Heritage Statement). The Conservation Officer’s insistence that they are reinstated severely undermines the credibility of her position.

We had permission to remove all of the plastic casement windows in the 2023 application. We also had permission to fill in over 50% - better to infill 100%

These windows as proved were fitted in the 1990’s. Drawings LF/063 & 4 /87 – LF/083/96 and historic plan drawing clearly demonstrate no windows existed in these elevations until late 1990’s. The previous owner installed these It would appear that the Conservation Officer is evidently not reading the documents properly or looking at the plans as reliable evidence. There is nothing to suggest they are inaccurate.

Demolition of Chimney

Justified removal by the Mc Carey Simmons report.

Built in Cupboards

This was always a wardrobe. We have simply introduced a back-to-back wardrobe to facilitate modern living. All the internal walls have been lime plastered. The units are completely removable and have been scribed around the original frame – we are baffled as to why this might be considered harmful in any way shape or form. This was removable joinery, so not a material heritage concern as its reversible.

Layout Utility room

Not aware of any previous concern. HE does not raise any objection to this.

Suggested Heritage Benefits and Public Benefits

The proposed benefits, which are listed (and it is a long list – which is good because the Conservation Officer has to concede and give weight to these) “*could also have sat alongside the approved scheme or have been undertaken separately from any other works*”. But the fact is they did not, and they DO form part of this scheme now before the Council and they also require Listed Building Consent to be regularised so must be weighed into the overall balance. It is illegitimate to suggest that a benefit needs to be directly related to an aspect of a scheme which is otherwise harmful in order to be weighed favourably. Harm must be accompanied by clear and convincing justification (para 213), but there is no requirement for a corresponding heritage benefit that relates directly to a harmful change (would that were possible) to be offered up. The proposed benefits of the scheme ought to be considered holistically, looking at the heritage asset as a whole.

I believe the approach is incorrect on the weighing of the application by insisting that some changes must be dealt with via enforcement notice. There is no requirement to do it that way and this could also lead to problems because of conjecture. The swingeing approach to the proposed benefits is more than a little vindictive.

I think we have very clearly demonstrated a large number of heritage benefits secured by this proposal which cumulatively amount to much more than a ‘relatively minor benefit’. Taken as a whole, the benefits are substantive, and the harm is no more than at a low to moderate level, even accepting some permanent erosion of significance due to the removal of the staircase. The Conservation Officer also conveniently ignores many benefits like the Front Elevation, Water Well, Securing Heritage assets as a high-class single dwelling, Lime plaster throughout and many more in the list of 28 points previously submitted. It is the Conservation Officer’s responsibility to consider all the heritage benefits presented in coming to a recommendation and it is also for the Planning Officer to independently weigh all these in the planning balance when completing the report to Committee. I am sure that you will do so.

Finally, it is noteworthy that in your report in respect of the 2023 application, which was approved, the level of harm was considered to “*less than substantial at a mid-level*” like the current situation.

Kind regards,

Peter

Peter Rainie | Principal Director of Planning | Tel: 01293 60516 |

r

0

For and on behalf of DMH Stallard LLP

Origin One, 108 High Street, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 1BD

t



IMPORTANT MESSAGE:

Please be aware of cyber crime. DMH Stallard LLP will NOT notify changes to our bank account details by email.

If you receive any communications suggesting that the firm's bank account details have changed, you should contact the firm via the number on the firm's website or headed notepaper immediately to confirm the details before making payment.

Please be aware that a phishing email may contain a fraudulent phone number for DMH Stallard LLP. DMH Stallard LLP will not take responsibility if you transfer money to a wrong account.

DMH Stallard LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales (registered number OC338287).

Its registered office is at The Portland Building, 27-28 Church Street, Brighton, East Sussex. BN1 1RB and it is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (ID. 490576).

The term "partner" is used to refer to a member of DMH Stallard LLP or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications. A list of our members, and of the non-members who are designated as partners, is open to inspection at our Brighton office.

[Please click here to see our disclaimer](#)

[Please don't print this email unless you really need to](#)

.



From: Susan Dubberley <Susan.Dubberley@midsussex.gov.uk>

Sent: 18 May 2026 16:41

To: Rainier, Peter <Peter.Rainier@dmhstallard.com>

Subject: RE: Marlow House DM/25/3131 and 3132 [DMHS-DMS.FID8001034]From Subject
Received Size Categories

PLEASE EXERCISE CAUTION - This message originated outside your firm.

Dear Peter,

I am not sure if you have seen Emily's final comments on the website which I have attached to this email as agreed.

As I am now in the process of writing my report for the planning committee on 11th June, can we therefore agree a further extension of time until 15th June.

Kind Regards

Sue Dubberley BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

Senior Planning Officer

Development Management

(01444 477590)

(Please note my working days are Monday to Thursday)

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.

<mime-attachment>