

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 16 April 2025 08:50:08 UTC+01:00
To: "Anna Tidey" <anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Conservation Officer comments for DM/25/0270 and 0271 The Toll House, High Street, LF

Hi Anna

I note Mr Perez's response below to my comments. All generally looks acceptable although I will leave it up to you whether the issue with the size of the rooflights to the retained rear outshot can be dealt with by condition?

W.r.t. the rooflight to the side roofslope, this appears to be a misunderstanding- I am not referring to the rebuilt rear extension but to the side roof of the main house- one of the proposed drawings shows a rooflight to the northern side of the main house roof. Perhaps this is an error, but if not it does raise the concerns previously noted.

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>



From: Jonathon Pérez <jonathonperez@gmail.com>
Sent: 07 April 2025 09:06
To: Joanne Fisher <Joanne.Fisher@midsussex.gov.uk>; Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>

Cc: Anna Tidey <anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk>; servicesupport <servicesupport@midsussex.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: Conservation Officer comments for DM/25/0270 and 0271 The Toll House, High Street, LF

Anna,

Many thanks for passing on Emily's comments, I have added them to the word file attached, to make it easier to review and respond. Emily's comments are in black and ours in red, in the attached. All looks great and we will provide the documentation required as per the conditions. We are happy to clarify anything if required.

There is only one comment that we would like to explore. This relates to the rooflights in our proposed kitchen, which will be the heart of our home and because of this we are requesting this be reviewed by Emily.

Thank you and I trust we can resolve this one item within the timeframe for determination on 28-Apr-2025.

Emily's comment are in black and ours in red:

"The new rooflight to the side **roofslope** appears somewhat incongruous in this currently unbroken roof slope. We also have no information in front of us regarding the impact on the historic fabric of the roof. **As per the proposal and acceptance above the outbuilding and its roof would be removed and replaced (the asbestos roof would be disposed of).** I would recommend that this aspect of the proposal is omitted. **Our Heritage team have again reviewed this weekend and do not believe this element of the proposal with the current design is harmful to the property.**

In the interests of resolving, it is proposed: If the rooflights are reduced in scale would this be considered acceptable, as per the other rooflights? If this is still not considered acceptable, if the proposal reduces the rooflights in this area from 3 to 2 and a reduction in the scale, would this be considered acceptable?

These drawings are part of the conditions, as such, we assume updated drawings for these rooflights are not required prior to determination, following agreement.

Thank you for your consideration."

On Sun, 6 Apr 2025 at 15:37, Jonathon Pérez <jonathonperez@gmail.com> wrote:

Joanne,

Thank you for your email and time on Friday.

Legal have requested could you please provide the regulation statement that requires the application to be re-advertised. You stated they must be viewable side by side and not embedded in a single document.

I do not support your statement that the drawings are not “clear” as the pdf drawings that are uploaded individually are to A4 scale and these are the identical PDFs that were placed into the DAS at A4 and so are to scale, clear and scalable.

I also do not support that this was picked up recently. This issue was known by Anna prior to her site visit on the 19th of March 2025. 16 days prior to Friday. At which point Anna also provided reassurance there would be no delay to the determination.

We offered to resend any documentation during this visit. Anna reassured us this was not required and it was an issue your end. I checked the online portal that day and the drawings were loaded landscape vs portrait and the drawings were clear to view in the DAS.

During our call you stated the requirement to re-advertise. This was challenged and you stated this was a legal requirement on your side otherwise you would not be able to provide a determination. In effect rejecting our proposal. We had no choice but to agree. Thank you for actioning.

During our call it was also agreed with yourself that all documentation would be in place for determination the following day after the 21 days, to ensure further delay was not incurred. Making determination 28-Apr-2025.

With regard to Emily’s comments our Heritage team have reviewed, and we will respond separately as this is a different issue (though we are still confused how the process can accommodate comments even from an internal, in the last day prior to determination).

Thank you for your efforts in helping us with our home and we look forward to restoring this beautiful building.

On 4 Apr 2025, at 16:45, Joanne Fisher
<Joanne.Fisher@midsussex.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Perez,

I refer to the above applications currently under consideration and your voicemail messages you have left me today.

I appreciate your frustration in respect of the requirement for the application to be re-advertised so close to the determination date. The plans have not been fully available to view on the online register which has been picked up recently by the case officer. To provide full and fair consideration and to avoid the decision being subject to challenge, it is considered necessary to re-advertise the application. This is so the plans can be fully considered by all interested parties as the documents previously loaded to the online register did not show the plans in full. Whilst the plans were included in the submitted Design and Access Statement, these are not clear and there is a requirement for the plans to be provided outside of this document.

Although the current consultation period has closed as no decision has been made on the application to date comments can still be accepted.

Following our conversation this afternoon I can confirm that I have spoken to Anna, and she will be re-advertising the application today. Once the re-consultation period has finished, she will then be able to make her recommendation and determine the application.

I trust this clarifies the planning position.

Kind regards

Joanne

Joanne Fisher BSc (Hons), MATP, MRTPI
Team Leader Applications
Development Management
Tel: 01444 477330
joanne.fisher@midsussex.gov.uk
www.midsussex.gov.uk

Working together for a Better Mid Sussex.

<image001.png>

<image003.png>

From: Jonathon Pérez <jonathonperez@gmail.com>

Sent: 04 April 2025 13:57

To: Anna Tidey <anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk>

Cc: Joanne Fisher <Joanne.Fisher@midsussex.gov.uk>; servicesupport
<servicesupport@midsussex.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: Conservation Officer comments for DM/25/0270 and 0271 The Toll House, High Street, LF

Thank you for sharing the comments we will review and revert over the weekend. Further to the issues with uploading documents, I understood comments to be closed. How is it possible to receive comments a day prior to determination?

I have tried again to contact Joanne, to discuss the re advertisement. As all the plans were all available on your portal. So we do not see the justification for re advertising.

And would still like to speak to Joanne when available.

Thank you.

On 4 Apr 2025, at 12:25, Anna Tidey
<anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Perez

Thank you for your email.

Please see Emily Wade's comments, which are attached to my email below.

As I explained to your wife on my site visit I had expected the plans to have been correctly uploaded **on the day of my Site Visit** by the Service Support Team, as I had made them aware of the problem that morning. If this had been the case there would not have been a delay. Unfortunately, due to other workload pressures, my instructions for this to occur were not acted upon until yesterday. This is an administrative error for which I sincerely apologise.

I can assure you that I will review Emily's comments as soon as I can and then I can advise you on the best way forward to reach a positive outcome.

Regards

Anna

Submit your planning application online.

<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk>

Anna Tidey BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

Planning Officer
Development Management

Tel: +44 (0)1444 477342

anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk

<http://www.midsussex.gov.uk>

<image001.png>

Working together for a Better Mid Sussex.



- **SAVE A TREE** Only print this email if absolutely necessary.

From: Jonathon Pérez <jonathonperez@gmail.com>

Sent: 04 April 2025 11:14

To: Anna Tidey <anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk>

Cc: Joanne Fisher <Joanne.Fisher@midsussex.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: Conservation Officer comments for DM/25/0270 and
0271 The Toll House, High Street, LF

Thank you for your email.

Could you please share the comments as soon as possible, as the application has been guided by Emiliys previous comments on the last application and appeal and pre consultation.

I have tried calling the number provided, and have left a message for Joanne. As mentioned the DAS has all the drawings and is definitely available to view on your website. So we do not understand the requirement to re-advertise.

The parish council have also comment demonstrating this is available.

We also do not understand why this is all the day before decision. Especially after 2 years of back and forth and your recent reassurances of no delays during your recent site visit.

On 4 Apr 2025, at 12:00, Anna Tidey
<anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Perez

Further to my call to you this morning I have now received the comments on your two applications that I have been awaiting from Emily Wade, Conservation Officer.

As these are very detailed I will need some time to review these and when I have done this I will get back to you.

From a brief discussion with Emily I believe that there are a number of matters that you will wish to address ahead of the decisions and a request for amendments/additional information.

I hope that you have been able to speak to Joanne Fisher regarding the readvertisement requirement that I called you about this morning.

I will be in touch.

Regards

Anna

Submit your planning application online.

<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk>

Anna Tidey BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

Planning Officer

Development Management

Tel: +44 (0)1444 477342

anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk

[uk](http://www.midsussex.gov.uk)

<http://www.midsussex.gov.uk>

<image002.png>

Working together for a Better Mid Sussex.



- SAVE A TREE Only print this email if absolutely necessary.

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 April 2025 10:29
To: Anna Tidey <anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/25/0270 and 0271 The Toll House, High Street, LF

Hi Anna

Comments on the above planning and listed building consent applications.

Toll House is a Grade II listed building located in a prominent position on Lindfield High Street. The building originally dates from the 15th – 16th century, possibly constructed as a cross wing to a larger medieval house sited to the south, which was later replaced. It was extended to its west, street facing elevation c.1630, at which time a substantial chimney stack was also added to the rear of the building. A lean-to addition was made to the rear of the building during the 18th century. The building was used as a toll house between 1803 and 1884, in association with toll gates placed across the adjacent road. The property has a rear yard which is partly occupied by a range of outbuildings along its southern edge, which are suggested to date from the first half of the 20th century, replacing earlier structures in this position.

The current applications follow on from refusal of planning and listed building consent for works including the reconfiguration of the rear ground floor layout, other internal alterations including installation of insulation and restoration of the main

fireplace, and external works including removal of part of the existing rear addition and construction of a single storey rear extension, a new porch to the side of the building, rebuilding of a party boundary wall, and a new front boundary fence and gate. Subsequent appeals were dismissed.

The current proposal attempts to address the contentious aspects of the previous applications. The works now proposed include:
Externally:

1. Removal and replacement of the outbuildings to the rear with a single storey extension with a glazed link to the house;
2. Reinstatement of a fence and gates to the front of the property;
3. Reinstatement of the cellar window to the side elevation;
4. Replacement of the existing window to the front gable at attic level;
5. Removal of lettering from the front elevation;
6. Replacement of guttering;
7. Timber frame repairs;
8. New rooflight to the side roof slope;
9. Repair and rebuilding of the northern side boundary party wall;
10. Relaying of a the brick path to the side of the house.

Internally:

11. Installation of internal insulation to some external walls;
12. Reconfiguration of the layout at ground and first floors;
13. Reconfiguration of staircase and creation of a shower room at second floor; and
14. Replacement of modern floor finishes.
15. Reinstatement of a fireplace to the ground floor front room.

To consider these works in turn:
Externally:

16. The existing outbuildings are suggested to date from the first half of the 20th century. In dismissing the previous appeals on the site,

the Inspector concluded that their removal would result in only minor harm to the special interest of the listed building. In this context, the principle of their demolition and replacement is considered potentially acceptable, subject to the quality of the design of the replacement structure. As shown, the extension would take the form of a brick built annexe under a monopitch roof forming a lean-to resting against the retained high brick southern boundary wall. This annexe would have large metal framed doors and windows to both western and northern elevations, large rooflights to the slate roof, and would be attached to the house by a fully glazed link. The existing lean-to to the rear of the house itself, which is partly 18th or 19th century in date, would be partly retained, with the fabric to be removed identified as dating from the 20th century. Large rooflights would be included within the roof of this addition.

On the basis of the Inspector's comments, the principle of the demolition and rebuilding of the existing outbuildings is considered difficult to resist. It is noted that the existing lean-to, which is of more interest, is to be partially retained. This is also considered acceptable, although see below w.r.t. the rooflights to the lean-to roof.

The proposed replacement rear annexe/outbuilding retains a similar monopitch lean-to roof set against the party boundary wall to the existing structure, but is slightly wider in footprint. It is however set off the rear of the house by a fully glazed link. On balance, this is considered acceptable, as the extension has a similar relationship to the house and in particular the 17th century chimney stack as the existing situation. As noted with previous applications, the submitted elevations are quite basically represented and are lacking in detail. An

appropriate condition is therefore recommended below.

I would also note that the rooflights to the roof slope of the existing, retained lean-to appear overscaled - notwithstanding that this fabric is suggested to date from the 20th century I would suggest that they should be reduced in size in terms of both their width and their depth so that they are more subordinate to the existing solid roof of the structure.

17. The proposed new fence to the front of the building is sympathetic to the context and is not considered contentious.
18. The reinstatement of the cellar window in an existing opening is not considered contentious subject to detail.
19. The proposed replacement window at attic level is not considered contentious subject to detail.
20. The removal of the lettering to the front elevation is not considered contentious and should enhance the appearance of this part of the building.
21. The proposed replacement rain water pipework includes faux 'cast iron' uPVC guttering, which would not normally be considered acceptable in the context of a listed building within a Conservation Area, however in this instance plastic guttering is already in place. On balance, this aspect of the proposal is therefore considered acceptable.
22. Repairs are proposed to the timber framing to the side elevation of the building. While this is not considered contentious in principle, further information on the nature and extent of the repairs would be required, which could be requested by condition.
23. The new rooflight to the side roofslope appears somewhat incongruous in this currently unbroken roof slope. We also have no information in front of us regarding the

impact on the historic fabric of the roof. I would recommend that this aspect of the proposal is omitted.

24. The proposed rebuilding of the brick wall is justified by a structural report which confirms the poor condition of the existing wall. The proposal is to rebuild the wall on a more or less like-for-like basis, saving the inclusion of weep holes and a differing corner detail, which are not considered contentious, although I do have a query stemming from the structural report. This states that to be structurally sound the wall can be reconstructed in the same manner as existing (i.e. a single brick in thickness) to a height of 1.35m, which is the height of the majority of the existing wall. However the front portion of the wall, adjacent to the High Street, is 2.05m high, and the plans suggest that the proposal is to also reconstruct this section to its existing height. Can the applicant please confirm that this is also a structurally sound detail?
25. The proposal to lift and reinstate the brick pathway to the side of the house is not considered contentious.

Internally:

26. Although the internal insulation was not considered contentious in principle, the level of detail provided with the previous applications was insufficient and was a reason for refusal. The current applications contain further information with respect to the location and detailing of the insulation, which confirms that existing exposed timbers will remain exposed, as well as providing typical sectional details. The proposed drawings also confirm that relevant Historic England guidance will be conformed to in terms of the methodology of the work. This aspect of the proposal is now therefore considered acceptable.
27. The proposed alterations to the layout at ground and first floor are minor and do not adversely affect fabric or floorplan of interest.

This work is therefore not considered contentious.

28. The proposed staircase reconfiguration and new shower room at second floor affect only modern fabric and plan form and are not considered contentious, subject to detail.
29. The replacement of modern floor finishes is unlikely to be regarded as contentious subject to detail.
30. A detailed method statement has been provided relating to the proposed reinstatement of a blocked up hearth to the front room at ground floor. This is not considered contentious subject to detail of the stone to be used for the new hearth.

In summary the majority of the scheme before us is considered acceptable, and successfully addresses the issues raised by the previous appeal scheme. However elements of the proposal require amendment/further information.

On a technical note, just to double check please that in any eventual determination all of the application documents including the DAS and the HE guidance note will be included among the plans listed on any decision notice, as these are material to the content of the application.

I would recommend the following conditions which the applicant may wish to consider and comment on at this juncture. These conditions could be (as appropriate) prior to the commencement of work on the relevant part of the proposal, as opposed to general commencement):

31. Details of roofing and facing materials.
32. Details of the brick to the rebuilt boundary wall.
33. Brickwork to the boundary wall to match existing in colour, texture and bonding

pattern and in colour, texture and style of pointing.

34. Fully detailed elevational and sectional drawings at an appropriate scale of the extension and link to show detail of window and door openings including window and door heads, fenestration, external doors etc.
35. Detailed drawings, at an appropriate large scale, including elevations and sections and annotated to show materials and finishes, of the following aspects of the scheme:
 36. - new windows to the house and extension including the new attic windows (the partial construction sections included on some of the drawings are not sufficient)
 37. - typical eaves details to the link and extension
 38. - new external and internal doors
 39. - (LBC ONLY) the new banister to the staircase at second floor
40. Details of the stone to the reinstated hearth in the front room at ground floor (LBC ONLY)
41. Further details of the proposed timber frame repairs to include annotated plans to show the location and extent of the repairs, and a detailed schedule of work, including materials and methods to be employed.

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>

[<image001.jpg>](#)

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.

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.

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.