

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 14 May 2026 13:35:10 UTC+01:00
To: "Susan Dubberley" <Susan.Dubberley@midsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: "Steve Ashdown" <Steve.Ashdown@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/25/3131 and 3132 Marlow House, High Street, Lindfield

Hi Sue

Final comments on the above planning and listed building applications. As you know there is very extensive documentation which has been submitted as part of this proposal; for clarity I am relying on the original submission alongside the emails from Peter Rainier dated 17th February and 30th March, with attachments, which I believe should be comprehensive in terms of content. Mr Rainier has provided a summary of the revisions made to the proposal in the latter of these two emails, which should also be comprehensive.

Introduction and background:

The site, Marlow House, is a Grade II listed building located on Lindfield High Street, within the Conservation Area. Planning permission and listed building consent were granted in 2023 for extensive internal and external alterations, including demolition and replacement of previously existing modern rear additions, and internal works including changes to the plan form, and new services. These permissions allowed for a comprehensive refurbishment of the property to modern standards, including substantial replacement rear extensions, and were achieved after lengthy discussions with Officers to revise the proposal and remove or amend aspects which were initially considered unacceptable.

Works on site are now complete and unfortunately are not in accordance with the approved plans. As built the development includes, and in some cases exceeds, numerous works which were removed from or amended during the course of the original applications, following Officer advice that the impact on the special interest of the listed building would be unacceptable. These works included, but were not limited to, the enlargement of the approved rear extensions, demolition and replacement of the bakehouse, demolition of the 17th century staircase within the core of the house, and removal or concealment of other significant historic fabric including the 17th century attic floor structure and floorboards above the southeast bedroom. Recent applications to attempt to regularise the situation, including some further works, were refused by Planning Committee.

The current applications are a second attempt to regularise the position. As much of the work included in the current proposals replicates that forming part of the recently refused planning and listed building consent applications, with which Members will be familiar, I will not repeat my previous comments in full, but rather respond to any amendments which are now proposed, as well as briefly highlighting other remaining areas of concern.

The previous condition of the building, refurbishment and quality of workmanship:

In terms of the claims made within the submitted Planning Statement I would reiterate that the building was not previously 'at risk' nor was it in the state of extreme neglect which has been suggested by the applicant. To the best of our knowledge, with the exception of one issue with a prop post within the ground floor reception room which was addressed, with input from a structural engineer, by works included in the 2023 approvals, the house was in good structural condition, albeit decoratively tired. This is supported by the photographs taken on site prior to the commencement of works which were put before Members in their consideration of the previously refused schemes. The previous condition of the building is therefore not a justification for the extent and nature of the harms to the plan form and fabric of the building which have taken place.

As noted above, the 2023 approvals allowed for extensive works of refurbishment and modernisation, including replacement of the previously existing rear additions, which could have resulted in a very attractive, comfortable and well-appointed family home with no harm to the listed building or Conservation Area.

I would also reiterate that we have no issue with the quality of the scheme in terms of the craftsmanship or the nature of the finish which has been achieved. However, these factors do not mitigate for the harms arising from the scale of the rear additions, loss of fabric, and adverse impact on plan form which have occurred. This quality of finish could very happily have sat alongside the approved scheme to produce a lovely family home, without harm or loss to the listed building.

Amendments to the proposals following the refusal of previous applications:

The proposal now includes further works where historic fabric has been removed from the historic core of the building, or historic plan form compromised, to attempt to address the harm which has been caused to the special interest of the Grade II listed house:

- The 17th century staircase

The application includes construction of a timber winder staircase and partial enclosure in place of the 17th century staircase which has been removed. In contrast to the previous applications, the current proposal is for a replacement timber winder staircase including reinstatement of a timber enclosure at ground floor, and at ground floor a basement access door. A winder stair with a plaster soffit and plank door is proposed at first floor, with an attic hatch above.

Firstly, for clarity with reference the Design and Access Statement (DAS), there was no '*confusion*' or '*degree of ambiguity*' as to whether the staircase was to be retained or not as part of the approved 2023 scheme. The retained staircase is clearly shown on the approved floor plans, and the matter was discussed at length both in person and by exchange of emails with the applicant and his agents during the course of the original applications.

In terms of the current proposal, the DAS also refers to the re-use of '*Some sections of salvaged timber*', however no detail is given of the nature or extent of this timber, nor do we have any evidence (photographic or otherwise) to corroborate that any part of the removed 17th century fabric was retained. Little weight can therefore be given to this aspect of the proposal.

The proposal now includes recreation of access from ground to first, and first to attic floors, where the stair had been apparently previously closed off. Whilst viewed in isolation this is a limited heritage benefit, in particular in respect of the opening between ground and first floors (that between first floor and attic would be closed by a hatch, see below), this does not outweigh the harm arising from the comprehensive loss of historic fabric, in particular as this work could have been carried out alongside the retention of the previously existing staircase. It therefore provides no justification for its demolition and replacement.

The reinstatement of a staircase would be sought by the Council to at partially mitigate the harm caused to the plan form and historic circulation pattern of the building. However, the DAS acknowledges that the reinstatement will be partly conjectural, due to the '*limited information of the historic condition*', so that previously surviving evidence of the original form, construction and evolution of the stair will be lost. The loss of historic fabric which has occurred is considerable, and the harm arising from this initial and irrevocable loss will not be mitigated by the current proposal, nor will it be outweighed by the proposal to recreate the vertical functionality of the stair.

If the Council were to approve the current applications, it is in effect taking the position that removing and replacing 17th century fabric without any justification and in the full knowledge of the harm that would be caused to the special interest of the building is acceptable. Whilst we should be seeking the reinstatement of facsimile fabric where significant features such as the staircase have been removed, 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.

Historic England continue to object to this aspect of the proposal.

- Partition within the ground floor reception room:

At ground floor within the main reception room, it is now proposed to reinstate a wall jamb and horizontal timber member where a historic partition has been removed. From the submitted plans, including the detail plan 5026 A, it would appear there is however no intention to reinstate the infill panels to the wall, which means that the proposed work will not be a full reinstatement of the partition in its previous appearance and solidity. The proposed works therefore will have only a limited impact in reinstating this aspect of the historic floor plan,

and will not mitigate for the irreversible loss of historic fabric which has occurred.

Historic England continue to object on grounds of loss of historic fabric.

- South-east bedroom:

To the southeast bedroom at first floor, above which the overlying 17th century attic floor structure and floorboards have been removed to create a vaulted ceiling, it is proposed to reinstate floor joists, but with the vaulted ceiling retained, and full floor structure including floorboards not reinstated.

With respect to this part of the application, there are inaccuracies and inconsistencies with the submitted plans and supporting documents which have unfortunately not been addressed despite a request to the agent:

1. The submitted planning statement states that the 2023 consent allowed for the removal of the pre-existing historic floor joists. This is not correct and should be amended.
2. The DAS in the section regarding the exposure of timber framing includes the ceiling of the southeast bedroom as an area where it is stated that *'finishes have been adjusted to reveal the historic timber framework.'* This is at best disingenuous, bearing in mind that the underlying historic timber framework has in fact been partially demolished.
3. The applicant has not clarified where the *'reclaimed oak timber rafters'* used in the faux vaulted roof to its western side have been derived from. It is therefore not clear if this fabric taken from a different, historic position within the house.
4. The detailed sectional drawing provided is misleading in labelling a previously existing timber within the roof space as a *'rafter'*. This is not a rafter intended to support a roof covering above, or vaulted ceiling/skelling beneath, it is a brace, an internal member of the roof structure. The 'prior to works' plans are annotated to show *'non original ceiling build up'* with no mention of the 17th century floor structure which was in place and has been removed. This requires amendment. The proposed plans and DAS should also be amended- the works are not to reinstate non-original timber joists, they are to reinstate joists in place of the original joists which have been lost. They are also not to expose the existing vaulted ceiling- there was no vaulted ceiling in place. The work proposed is to retain the non-original vaulted ceiling which has been installed, open to view, with modern joists replacing the historic joists which have been lost. This requires clarification and amendment.
5. The description of the overlying floorboards is also inaccurate as to their claimed poor condition- with reference to photographs the in original heritage statement submitted as part of the approved 2023 scheme and the fact that the boards have been re-used as doors elsewhere in the building, this was clearly not the case. This should also be amended.
6. The DAS states that the timber frame was unaltered, as a significant portion of the 17th century attic floor structure has been removed.

7. It is worth noting that the DAS describes the floor structure of the attic as 'historic' (it uses the term rafters, but actually refers to the joists on which the timber base on which the water tank within the attic space has been placed). No indication or evidence is given as to why the applicant acknowledges this part of the attic floor to be historic, but suggests that the adjacent structure which has been demolished without consent just to the southeast was modern.

Notwithstanding the above points, the proposed insertion of modern floor joists to replace the historic joists which have been removed will not be adequate mitigation either in terms of the adverse impact on the floor plan and volume of the spaces affected at first floor and attic level, or of the fabric which has been lost from both the floor structure and the floorboards.

I further note and agree with Historic England's comments that *'This proposal would result in an awkward configuration and would therefore fail to mitigate the harm caused.'*

The revised Heritage Statement suggests that the exposure of soot blackened timbers (which were also mentioned in the Desbruslais Heritage Statement accompanying the approved applications, written prior to the commencement of works, and therefore at least partly visible before work commenced), results in a minor heritage benefit; however this would not mitigate the significant harm which has arisen from the loss of historic fabric, floor plan and volume to the first and attic floors of the building.

- The partition between the northern bedroom and dressing room:
Lime plaster infill reinstated to the partition between the northern bedroom and adjacent dressing room. This apparently replaces removed modern plasterboard and is on this basis acceptable, subject to detail.
- 17th century floorboards at first floor:
'Reclaimed' aged oak timber floorboards are to be laid to southwest corner of the attic, according to the relevant proposed plan, however the DAS states that the boards will be manufactured by a local supplier. This inconsistency should be corrected. In any case, it would appear these are not the original floorboards which have been removed, so the loss of historic fabric will not be adequately mitigated. Some of the original floorboards do remain in the house, having been made into doors and the basement access hatch. The applicant has not offered to return these boards to their original location- I would suggest that this would be a requirement of any enforcement notice.
The 'details' drawing in this respect is also misleading, as the area outlined and labelled '*some floorboards removed*' does not show accurately the extent of the loss of fabric. The pre-existing floorboards have been removed from the entire attic space. Not all of these were original, but original boards did survive throughout the southern end of the attic, as shown in the photographs within the

Heritage Statement submitted with the original, approved applications from 2023. This should be amended.

- Attic access hatch

The creation of an attic access hatch above the reinstated stair enclosure is proposed. The use of salvaged floorboards to create the hatch door is noted, but where are these to be taken from? If salvaged floorboards from the building have been retained, these should be reinstated in their original position, not chopped up and re-used. The hatch itself will allow potential access in the original position to the attic space, but is a limited benefit given that it does not reinstate the original open access between the stair and attic, and the possibility that the hatch door will in practice be kept closed, and the area above used for storage.

- The bakehouse:

It is proposed to reinstate an area of brickwork above the French windows to the rear elevation of the reconstructed bakehouse. This results in an elevational treatment closer to the approved scheme, but does not mitigate for the loss of the original fabric from this elevation or the bakehouse overall, which was demolished without consent. I note and would agree with Historic England's comments that this represents only a superficial replica of the building's historic form.

In addition, further works not relating to the removal of previously identified historic fabric or plan form are now proposed:

- Internalised window at first floor:

It is proposed to replace the first-floor level internalised casement window within the Gothic arch to the 19th century rear range with a sash window, which is suggested to be truer to the original nature of this window, and is claimed as a heritage benefit. However, any benefit which arises from this will be largely removed by the internalising of the gable of which this window is part- contrary to the claims within the revised heritage statement there is no meaningful visibility of the gable or window from external viewpoints.

- Loft insulation:

The introduction of breathable insulation within the loft is noted in the revised Heritage Statement. Any benefit arising from this could have been achieved without the harms caused by other aspects of the scheme. This work could have sat alongside the previously approved applications, for example.

- Services plans

A number of new plans have been submitted which were not part of the recently refused or 2023 schemes – presumably, the intention is to ensure that the applications are fully comprehensive in terms of regularising the position. These include water service plans. Unfortunately, these raise an additional issue which is the notching of joists at first floor to allow for the installation of the sink to the

ensuite to the central room of the historic core of the house. This will have resulted in loss of historic fabric dating, it is assumed, from the 17th century, when the original open hall of the building was floored over at this level. This is not good practice in updating services to historic buildings and would not normally be regarded as acceptable- an alternative pipe layout should have been considered, or the sink in question relocated to remove the necessity for the work.

Unauthorised works not addressed by the current proposals:

In addition to the above aspects where some amendments are indicated, there are several areas where significant harm has been caused to the special interest of the building and which formed part of the refused applications, which are not addressed by any revision within the current proposals. In some instances, further justification for the retention of these works is offered within the DAS or other supporting documents, which I will address as necessary.

- Scale and extent of extensions at first floor level. Engulfing of 19th century rear wing.

The submitted DAS remarks that the approved scheme revealed a great amount of the existing house, but suggested that this resulted in a fragmented, unbalanced collection of volumes of differing styles and in different planes. It also suggests that although the window to the rear of the 19th century wing is exposed, because it is different in style to the windows to the rear additions and bakehouse it adds to the 'fragmented' appearance of the listed building. This clearly demonstrates a lack of understanding of the nature of the special interest of the listed building, which is derived in part from its evolution over many centuries. The structures to the rear of the building, the 18th century bakehouse (now lost) and 19th century rear wing (enclosed by the enlarged extension at first floor) are a later part of this narrative, but still of interest.

As built, the enlarged rear extension creates a bland and uniform rear elevation which disguises or removes these aspects of the building's significance. This is not a new build house, it is a 600 year old listed building, which has evolved over several distinct phases. It is our ability to read these different phases in the fabric and layout of the building, and what this tells us about changes in construction techniques, and the way of life of the people living there, which is key to the building's special architectural and historical interest. However, the appearance of the house from the rear at present gives no indication of this.

The design changes in the scheme as built, including the use of more uniform materials, are claimed as benefits, however in my opinion this increased uniformity is not an advantage, as it also increases the apparent bulk of the additions to the building. The variety in roof form, and materials, apparent in the 2023 approved scheme act to break up the mass of the extensions and clearly differentiate them from the historic fabric.

The issue with datums in relation to openings is not always relevant in the context of a historic, multiphase building. While a new extension should sit comfortably alongside the existing building, creating uniformity of levels by removal or concealment of historic fabric is not an appropriate response. No benefit arises from this aspect of the extensions as built.

It should be noted that in the context of a listed building, the issue of public views is not the only or most relevant aspect of visual impact. Additions or external alterations to a listed building will always be considered 'in the round', whether or not public views of the building are affected. In this instance, the visual impact of the additions as constructed on the rear of the building is markedly detrimental. 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.

It should be noted that the HS whilst echoing the arguments made within the DAS acknowledges that the increased bulk of the rear extension does result in harm to the special interest of the listed building, albeit at a low level of less than substantial harm, in the author's opinion.

- Works at basement level

The removal of lime plaster from one wall only is proposed. The works at this level are claimed within the revised Heritage Statement as a heritage benefit, however the plaster to the remaining walls has concealed historic masonry and had an adverse impact on the character of the basement. The air circulating unit and French drain installed to address damp could have been implemented without this harmful work, so although potentially beneficial in their own right, do not justify the other harms arising.

- Demolition and rebuilding of the bakehouse

This work remains unjustified. No adequate structural report to support the necessity for this work has been received.

The DAS includes an extract from a Gould Baxter Bill of Quantities dated Sept 2023. This was not submitted to the Council until recently, however if as this suggests the applicant was aware prior to the commencement of works that these would exceed what was covered by the planning approvals, why was a further application not made?

The McCarey Simmonds Hazard Inventory also forming part of the current application is a list of possible structural issues arising from the proposed development, as a result of the works. It is not a structural condition survey. Again, if the applicant was aware prior to the commencement of work that a structural risk to the building was posed by the works envisaged, why was this not addressed before works started? If further work was considered necessary, why was the Council not approached?

The email from the same firm raises similar concerns- a potential issue was raised, but no appropriate action appears to have been taken. With respect to the Andrew Parker document, the structural condition of the building in 1999 is not relevant as we have no idea what repairs may subsequently have been undertaken.

- Insertion of WC to ground floor southern room

This work remains unjustified. Again, with respect to the submitted DAS, there was no ambiguity that this aspect of the proposal as submitted with the original scheme was unacceptable, hence why it was removed from the application prior to consent being granted.

I would stress as I have in the context of the previous, refused scheme that there would be no objection in principle to a WC within the extensive modern rear additions at ground floor, or within the bakehouse. This was suggested to the applicant during the course of the original 2023 applications, but was not adopted as an alternative. _

- The submitted Heritage Statement suggests that the removal of the adjacent blockwork wall which was previously concealed by stone nogging is a heritage benefit. The blockwork is not a sympathetic material, however the disruption of the historic plan form noted above outweighs any minor benefit that is accrued from its removal, particularly as it was previously concealed by stonework.

- Refacing of both chimney breasts at ground floor and at first floor within the dressing room, with modern fireplace inserts _

It is noted that the reinstatement of the inglenook was not considered practical, however this does not justify the loss of the previously existing, reduced but still traditionally proportioned fireplace. The new brick facing and contemporary raised hearths are completely unsympathetic to the context and disguise the historic nature of the chimney stack, which was one of the most important introductions made to the 'modernise' the building during the 17th century.

Historic England continue to object to this aspect of the proposal. _

- Subdivision of the central room at first floor to create a dressing area and ensuite. This adverse impact on the historic floor plan has not been addressed. I note that Historic England continue to object to this aspect of the proposals. The submitted Heritage Statement suggests that reopening of a previously present doorway in the adjacent partition is a heritage benefit which justifies this work, however we have no evidence relating to the date of this doorway, and it's reopening is not contingent on the subdivision of the adjacent room. _

- Modern oak flooring overlying 17th century flooring at first floor level. This is described as '*to match existing*' in the current submission, however the new

fabric does not match the original flooring which has apparently been concealed in dimensions, colour or patination. The attractive and characterful 17th century floorboards remain concealed, with damage arising to this fabric from the fixing of modern flooring above. It should be noted that although we are assuming that the application submission is correct that the historic flooring has been retained beneath the modern floorboards, we have no evidence to substantiate this.

I note that the submitted Gould Baxter report notes that the 17th century flooring was *'in good condition where visible'*.

The submitted HCUK Heritage Statement claims that this work is *'overall beneficial to historic character'*, but it is very difficult to understand how this statement can be justified given that the previously existing historic flooring, which was attractive, characterful and noted by the applicant's own consultants to be in good condition, has been concealed and possibly damaged by the work.

- Infilling of windows to original rear elevation. No amendment is proposed to these works, to which Historic England have objected.
- Demolition of the 19th century chimney. No further justification has been offered for this loss of historic fabric, which the revised HCUK Heritage Statement admits results in harm to the special interest of the building.
-
- Built in cupboards to east of chimney stack at first floor retained.
-
- Layout of ground floor utility room unaltered.

Suggested heritage and public benefits

In addition to the revised plans and supporting documents referenced above, the applicant has submitted other commentary, including HCUK notes on the previous planning committee meeting, and a revised section of the Heritage Statement by the same authors, received 17th February and 30th March respectively. These primarily address the perceived heritage benefits of the scheme.

The applicant suggests that the heritage benefits of the current proposals are not given adequate weight due to alleged ambiguity regarding the baseline against which the proposals should be considered. Clearly, as the approved scheme has not been implemented, we are considering the impact on the house and its special interest prior to the commencement of works. However, I believe that the above comments are unambiguous in demonstrating that harm has arisen on that basis.

Furthermore I would consider it a relevant consideration that although I would not dispute that aspects of the works which have taken place are beneficial, almost all of the works now claimed by the applicant as potential heritage or public benefits, including the exposure of the historic well, cleaning and exposure of parts of the timber

frame, reinstatement of an attic access hatch above the 17th century stair enclosure, repointing, omission of rooflights, replacement window to the south elevation, and underfloor heating could also have sat alongside the approved scheme, or have been undertaken separately from any other works, without any harm to the listed building arising.

The benefits claimed by the applicant are not contingent on the works which have taken place which have resulted in harm to the special interest of the listed building through loss of historic fabric or plan form, or through the increased size and amended form of the rear extensions.

Furthermore, the relatively minor benefit arising from these aspects of the proposal would not be considered to outweigh the significant harm caused by the outstanding issues raised above.

The most recent version of the DAS contains a lengthy discussion on the treatment of the timber frame within the historic core of the house, suggesting that the special interest of the building has been enhanced by removal of modern finishes such as plasterboard and wallpaper, exposure of previously covered areas of framing, and use of lime plaster for the refinished infill panels. Whilst I would not dispute that this work is in some respects beneficial, it must again be noted that it is not contingent on the harmful aspects of the scheme, but could have been carried out separately, or alongside the approved scheme, without any attendant harm to the listed building. The one does not, therefore, justify the other.

Furthermore, while the applicant may argue that the character of the timber frame is better expressed in some parts of the building by this work, in other areas it has been significantly harmed by removal of key elements such as the historic staircase, part of the attic floor structure, and the partition within the ground floor reception room.

As noted above, the arguments made within this section of the DAS are in some respects disingenuous, for example the claim that the historic timber framework of the southeast bedroom has been enhanced when in fact the works have resulted in significant loss of fabric from that framework, by the removal of the overlying 17th century attic floor structure. The new vaulted ceiling which has been introduced detracts from an appreciation of the historic proportions of the room and distorts the historic form of the timber frame to this part of the building, including the overlying roof form.

The applicant claims that insufficient weight has been previously attached to the benefits which they suggest arise from the scheme; however, I would dispute this. As noted above, we accept that some elements of the works which have taken place are positive. However, we must balance these positive aspects against the extensive harms which have arisen, which as discussed above are not adequately mitigated by the current revised proposals.

In summary:

- **The heritage benefits do not outweigh the harm arising to the building** from the unauthorised works, which are not fully mitigated by the current proposals.
- **What benefits have arisen are not dependent on the acceptance of the harmful aspects of the proposals**, such the loss of historic fabric or the scale and form of the rear extensions.
- Even while we are mindful of the ‘baseline’ argument made by the applicant, **it is a relevant consideration that these benefits could have been achieved by another scheme, such as the approvals obtained, which would not result in harm to the listed building**. For example, the removal of the 17th century staircase was not necessary to facilitate the overall renovation and modernisation of the building, it could with ease have been retained, as demonstrated by the approved applications.
- There is therefore in my opinion **no valid basis for any argument that the heritage benefits arising outweigh the harms caused**.

‘Precedent’ scheme:

The revised DAS included with the current application includes a supposed ‘precedent’ relating to a partially retrospective application at The Old Bakehouse, which is a II* listed building also located on Lindfield High Street. However, notwithstanding that each case must be considered on its own merits, this is not considered to be a comparable development:

- The WC which was introduced at ground floor to The Old Bakehouse is located to the western side of the chimney stack, in a previously enclosed space which housed a kitchenette. There was no adverse impact on the historic floor plan of the building arising from this work, unlike the situation at Marlow House.
- The replacement floor structure above the cellar was approved following the submission of clear evidence that the previously existing structure was modern. There was therefore no significant impact on historic fabric involved in this work.
- The ceiling structure removed at first floor level above the master bedroom was Georgian, but had previously been damaged by a significant water leak from an attic level water tank, and had partially collapsed. The removal of the remainder of the ceiling was considered acceptable on balance, following the submission of a structural report which demonstrated that the weight of the structure was imposing potentially damaging stresses on the much older and much more significant structure of the roof above. This decision was taken in consultation with Historic England and their structural engineers.
- The brick wall to the rear yard (actually subject of a separate application by the neighbouring property) replaced a previously existing modern brick wall which was structurally unsound. The new brickwork does appear as such, at present, in the context of the adjacent historic fabric, but is appropriate in its colour and nature, and should weather to match.

Historic England’s position:

As noted, Historic England continues to object to several aspects of the proposal. In addition to the areas highlighted in the comments above, they have continued to raise

concerns relating to the first floor rear extension, the demolition of the 19th century chimney stack, the vaulted ceiling to the south east bedroom, the ground floor WC, the inserted modern fireplaces, and the infilling of the window openings to the original rear elevation of the building.

Conclusion:

In my opinion, notwithstanding the reinstatement of some further aspects of original plan form which is now proposed, the applications continue to result in harm to the special interest of the listed building through loss of significant elements of historic fabric and plan form, and through the inappropriate scale and form of the rear extensions.

This is contrary to the requirements of District Plan policy DP34.

In terms of the NPPF, I would place the harm caused as less than substantial, at around the mid-high point of that scale. The balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 will apply, bearing in mind the great weight that must be given under paragraph 212 to the conservation of heritage assets, and that under paragraph 213 any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset must have a clear and convincing justification- demonstrably absent in this case, in particular in the context of the existing approvals. I also note and would agree with the emphasis placed by Historic England in their comments on paragraph 208 of the Framework, and their opinion that the proposal fails to avoid or minimise the conflict between the proposal and the conservation of the heritage asset.

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>

The
Electoral
Commission

You now need
photo ID to
vote at a
polling station

No ID? You can apply for free voter ID

Find out more at

electoralcommission.org.uk/voterID

or call 0800 328 0280