

APPENDICES

CONSERVATION OFFICER COMMENTS-ORIGINAL SCHEME

is likely to affect historic fabric and therefore to be contentious.

The replacement of the existing steel prop to the room north of the principle chimney stack with an oak post may not be contentious but I would like to see a structural report which explains the need for the prop/post, and if an issue is present, confirms that the solution proposed will be appropriate.

At ground floor various works to the flooring are indicated on the proposed plan. More information will be required in respect of these in terms of justification for the works, a detailed description of the nature of the existing flooring, its date and level of interest, and sectional drawings. The impact on the floor structure between ground and basement levels including the impact on the fabric of the ceiling of the basement should be made clear.

The removal of the 1830s rear wing at ground floor (and above) is discussed above, as is the partitioning within the ground floor rear extension to its northern side.

The existing staircase between ground and first floor within the rear addition is modern and is not of any special interest. Its replacement is not considered contentious in principle, subject to detail of the replacement design and its interaction with the retained fabric.

At first floor, the stair to attic level which it is proposed to remove dates from the 17th century (from the Heritage Statement) and is complete. This structure of a high level of interest and its removal will not be acceptable. It should be retained in situ.

The submitted Heritage Statement also refers to the loss of 'the upper part of the chimney flue through the first floor. This does not look to have included the stack and would presumably involve support to the stack somewhere in the eaves line. This would be an immeasurable loss of fabric and, given that this looks to be an early stack and flue and has interrelation with the late crown post roof structure, we would not support this removal.' I am not clear what is referred to here and would welcome clarification on this point. The removal of the added fire surround to the new ensuite/dressing room area is noted and is commented on below.

Also at first floor the proposal includes new partitioning within the existing central bedroom to create an ensuite and walk in wardrobe with new and blocked openings and removal of a built out fireplace, and built in wardrobes in various locations. As for the proposed partitioning at ground floor within the historic core of the building the proposed partitioning at first floor is not discussed in detail within the Heritage Statement but again appears to adversely affect the surviving historic plan of the building. The blocking of doorways would also result in no direct access between the southern and northern ends of the building, which will affect how it reads and will be unacceptable. The loss of the fire surround to the northern side of the principle chimney stack requires further clarification as to the date and level of interest of the fabric affected. The complete blocking of the fireplace opening on this side of the chimney is unlikely to be acceptable as without the surround or fireplace there will be no indication from this northern side of the presence of the chimney, or how these rooms were historically heated. The installation of extensive built in wardrobes and in some cases bathroom fittings such as shower enclosures raises potential issues with impact on/obscuring of underlying historic fabric.

Room 11 at this level is annotated as a 'plant room/airing cupboard'. More information should be provided as to what this means in practice, in particular the nature, positioning and connections of any new plant.

At attic level, the proposed new loft hatch sits in an area just to the north of the principle chimney stack. The submitted heritage statement suggests the survival of 17th century wide plank flooring in this area. More information would be needed regarding the exact location of the proposed hatch and its relationship to this flooring. Any loss of or damage to 17th century fabric, or later fabric of interest, will not be acceptable.

More information including sectional elevations will be required in respect of the new wall at attic level. These drawings should highlight the relationship with the existing historic fabric.

In respect of the garage, the proposal is to resite the building to the northern side of the garden, with the existing part built structure removed. The proposed new garage is shown as a contemporary style building with a flat green roof and vertical timber cladding. Whilst I would not consider there to be an in principle objection to the resiting of the garage building, the design as shown, in particular the flat roof form, is not sympathetic to the context, either to the setting of the listed building (and adjacent listed buildings) or to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. I would recommend that the design of the building is amended to a more appropriate hipped or gabled roof which better reflects the predominant roof forms of the surrounding buildings, as well as more traditional facing and roofing materials, and detailing including to the eaves and doors.

Subject to considerations of detailed design the proposed new vehicle gates are not considered contentious.

In summary, although I do think there is scope here for replacement or reconfiguration of the rear extensions, and possibly for some, more limited, alterations within the historic core, significant aspects of the current proposals are considered unacceptable in terms of their impact on the special historical and architectural interest of the listed building. This is due to impact on the historic fabric and plan form of the building, and how these are appreciated, as well as impact on the appearance of the building, particularly from the rear, and including the surviving 19th century rear addition and bakehouse. This will be contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. In terms of the NPPF I would consider the harm caused to be less than substantial, but at the high end of that scale. Paragraph 202 will apply.

I would also consider aspects of the proposal, in particular the external works to the rear and the proposed new garage, to be detrimental to the settings of the adjacent listed buildings to either side of the site, particularly perhaps Limes Cottage to the south. This will again be contrary to District Plan Policy DP34. In terms of the NPPF I would regard the harm caused as less than substantial, at the mid range of the scale. Paragraph 202 will again apply.

The proposal will also detract from the character and appearance of the Lindfield Conservation Area, contrary to the requirements of DP35 and causing a mid level of less than substantial harm.

It is unfortunate that the applicants did not seek pre-application advice prior to the submission of this proposal, as it is my opinion that there is scope in principle for works to replace or reconfigure the existing rear additions. In light of this it would be my recommendation that the current application is withdrawn and a pre-application discussion is entered into, before submission of a revised scheme. I would also suggest that any revised scheme would benefit from being based on, and guided by, a fully detailed historic building survey, ideally undertaken by a historic building archaeologist, so that the origins and development of the building are fully understood and that the Heritage Statement accompanying any future application can include a greater level of detail to inform consideration of the proposals.



Delegated Decision
Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/22/3694	Case Officer:	Susan Dubberley
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Demolition of the modern two-storey rear extension and demolition of the modern conservatory addition. Construction of a new, two-storey extension to the rear elevation. Alterations to Bakehouse structure to include reduced floor level, removal of mezzanine floor level, re-roofing works and internal insulation. Various works to the listed building to include roof and chimney repairs, window and door replacement, replacement of building services (mechanical and electrical) to include the installation of new sanitary accommodation. Demolition of partially-built three-bay garage and construction of new detached garage building. Associated hard and soft landscaping works, to include new timber gates and brick wall to driveway entrance, new permeable driveway surfacing and new planting. . (Amended plans received on 17th March 2023)		
Site:	Marlow House, 107 High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2HR, ,		
Validation Date	15 Dec 2022	Overall Expiry Date:	21 Apr 2023
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	12 May 2023
Target Date:	9 Feb 2023	Recommending Officer Signature:	Susan Dubberley

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	0
---	--	------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	Nick Rogers	Date:	12 May 2023
Comments:			

107 HIGH STREET, LINDFIELD, HAYWARDS HEATH, RH16 2HR

Date: 12th May 2023

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/22/3694

Marlow House, 107 High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2HR, Demolition of the modern two-storey rear extension and demolition of the modern conservatory addition. Construction of a new, two-storey extension to the rear elevation. Alterations to Bakehouse structure to include reduced floor level, removal of mezzanine floor level, re-roofing works and internal insulation. Various works to the listed building to include roof and chimney repairs, window and door replacement, replacement of building services (mechanical and electrical) to include the installation of new sanitary accommodation. Demolition of partially-built three-bay garage and construction of new detached garage building. Associated hard and soft landscaping works, to include new timber gates and brick wall to driveway entrance, new permeable driveway surfacing and new planting. . (Amended plans received on 17th March 2023) Mr And Mrs S Dougall

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

MSDC Conservation Officer - Objects

Lindfield Parish council: Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application, subject to MSDC Conservation Officer's satisfaction with the issues raised in the Heritage Statement.

REPRESENTATION RECEIVED

11 letters of support:

- The front of the house has not been maintained/decorated for the past 20+ years and the rear garden has been a rubbish tip for the same period. The current proposal to refurbish the house and to add a modern extension will enhance the High Street and the conservation area.
- We are aware of the condition of the rear of this property and having looked at the details of the planning application we are of the view that the proposed plans would be a most welcome enhancement to the site and offer our full support to the application.
- Plans including the latest revisions which will significantly benefit the property and this part of the High Street.
- This application will ensure that important listed properties are updated to protect their heritage whilst meeting modern living standards including climate change.
- It is incredibly important that Lindfield's historic houses are maintained, and it falls to a brave few to pick up the enormous cost of this. it is beyond vital that we allow these houses, not to be forced into a surreal time capsule stasis, but to be allowed to evolve as they always have done over time This plan is entirely sympathetic, intelligently designed and will also prove enormously beneficial to the village, so it should receive all of our support.
- Will be sensitively and carefully restored. We were impressed by the determination of its new owners, to use the materials and techniques wholly appropriate to a Listed building of significant age, and delighted that its High Street frontage, would be properly restore.
- Hugely disappointed to now see within the revised plans, the inclusion of the bedroom at first floor level, in the rear south-west corner. We feel that the inclusion of this existing section of Marlow House, and particularly its window, substantially detracts from the design integrity, uniformity, and visual appeal of the Rear Elevation, as originally proposed. We feel that these changes will add nothing of real value to the historic context of Marlow House when compared to the significant restoration to the main elements of the building, and that the original submitted Design for this was substantially better in all respects.

- Scheme professionally restores and thoughtfully preserves and maintains the historic elements of the original timber framed house and then moves forward to provide a contrasting and exciting extension, providing useable space for modern living.
- Whilst the works include some rebuilding and upgrading, and a certain amount of preservation is preferred clearly older properties benefit from upgrading to keep pace with developments in living conditions and required insulation and other essentials of living in the 21st century or properties will just become inefficient museum pieces.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the modern two-storey rear extension and demolition of the modern conservatory addition. Construction of a new, two-storey extension to the rear elevation. Alterations to Bakehouse structure to include reduced floor level, removal of mezzanine floor level, re-roofing works and internal insulation. Various works to the listed building to include roof and chimney repairs, window and door replacement, replacement of building services (mechanical and electrical) to include the installation of new sanitary accommodation. Demolition of partially-built three-bay garage and construction of new detached garage building. Associated hard and soft landscaping works, to include new timber gates and brick wall to driveway entrance, new permeable driveway surfacing and new planting.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

There is a concurrent listed building consent application for the same as this proposal currently being considered under planning reference DM/22/3695.

13/03755/FUL Oak framed detached garage. Approved

08/02665/FUL Construction of 2 bedroom single storey dwelling on land to the rear of 107 High street, Lindfield together with the removal of sections of fence to enable provision of vehicle access for 105, and 103 High Street. Refused

02/00851/FUL and 02/00852/LBC - Addition of a single storey conservatory to rear of existing building and addition of a dormer window to roof of existing single storey outhouse - Approved

LF/083/96/AP1 and LF/084/96/AP1 - Amended Plans: Two storey rear extension and demolish flat roof rear extension - Approved

LF/083/96 and LF/084/96 - Two storey rear extension and demolish flat roof rear extension - Approved

LF/063/87 and LF/064/87 - Extension and alterations to provide living accommodation following change of use from restaurant - Approved

LF/010/87 - Change of Use - From Restaurant to Residential - Approved (Approval Renewed in 1992 under reference LF/007/92)

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site 107 High Street contains a Grade II Listed building fronting the main High Street. The building was converted to residential use (from a former restaurant use) some time in the early 1990s. The dwelling sits directly onto the frontage pavement and has a large rear garden with vehicle access off Hickman's Lane (passing behind numbers 101, 103, and 105 High Street. There is a partially constructed three-bay garage in the rear garden.

To either side of the building are other listed buildings- Everydens to the north is listed Grade II and dates from the 17th century, and Limes Cottage to the south, also Grade II listed, dates from the 16th century.

The dwelling is situated within the Lindfield Conservation Area and the built up area as defined in the District and Neighbourhood Plans.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The current proposal is for works to the building both internally and externally, and within its setting, including: the demolition of the modern two-storey rear extension and demolition of the modern conservatory addition. Construction of a new, two-storey extension to the rear elevation. Alterations to Bakehouse structure to include reduced floor level, removal of mezzanine floor level, re-roofing works and internal insulation. Various works to the listed building to include roof and chimney repairs, window and door replacement, replacement of building services (mechanical and electrical) to include the installation of new sanitary accommodation. Demolition of partially-built three-bay garage and construction of new detached garage building. Associated hard and soft landscaping works, to include new timber gates and brick wall to driveway entrance, new permeable driveway surfacing and new planting.

The ground floor and first floor extension would replace the existing two storey extension. At ground floor the replacement extension would be set back some 3.5m in comparison with the existing extensions and would be constructed in brickwork with three sets of double full height glazed doors. The first-floor extension would overhang the ground floor by approximately 1m and would have a flat roof, with timber cladding and full height glazed double doors with full height windows either side of the door. The doors would lead out onto a balcony with metal balustrading and a privacy panel is proposed to the south elevation constructed of timber slats. The first floor would project out some 1.5m including the balcony further than the existing first floor extension and would be some 1m wider.

The new garage would be located in the rear garden alongside the northern boundary with 109 High Street and set some 1.5m from the boundary. The garage would measure some 9.5m in width with a depth of some 6.5m and a height of some 3m. The garage would be timber clad with a green roof.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND LIST OF POLICIES

Planning legislation holds that the determination of a planning application shall be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Using this as the starting point the development plan for this part of Mid Sussex consists of the District Plan, the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (SADPD), and the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan.

National policy (which is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance) does not form part of the development plan, but is an important material consideration.

District Plan

The District Plan was adopted in March 2018.

Relevant policies for consideration:

- DP26 - Character and Design
- DP34 - Listed Buildings and other Heritage Assets
- DP35 - Conservation Areas

Site Allocations Development Plan Document (SADPD)

The SADPD was adopted on 29th June 2022. It allocates sufficient housing and employment land to meet identified needs to 2031.

There are no relevant policies in relation to this proposal.



Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2039 Consultation Draft

The District Council is now in the process of reviewing and updating the District Plan. The new District Plan 2021 - 2039 will replace the current adopted District Plan. The draft District Plan 2021-2039 was published for public consultation on 7th November and the Regulation 18 Consultation period runs to 19th December 2022. No weight can currently be given to the plan due to the very early stage that it is at in the consultation process.

Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

The Council has adopted a 'Mid Sussex Design Guide' SPD that aims to help deliver high quality development across the district that responds appropriately to its context and is inclusive and sustainable. The Design Guide was adopted by Council on 4th November 2020 as an SPD for use in the consideration and determination of planning applications. The SPD is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.'

Neighbourhood Plan

The Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan was made in March 2016.

There are no relevant policies for consideration.

National Policy and Legislation

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

National Design Guide

Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990

ASSESSMENT

Design

Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design and states:

'All development and surrounding spaces, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings and replacement dwellings, will be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages while being sensitive to the countryside. All applicants will be required to demonstrate that development:

- is of high quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;*
- contributes positively to, and clearly defines, public and private realms and should normally be designed with active building frontages facing streets and public open spaces to animate and provide natural surveillance;*
- creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;*
- protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;*
- protects valued townscapes and the separate identity and character of towns and villages;*
- does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, and noise, air and light pollution (see Policy DP27);*
- creates a pedestrian-friendly layout that is safe, well connected, legible and accessible;*
- incorporates well integrated parking that does not dominate the street environment, particularly where high density housing is proposed;*
- positively addresses sustainability considerations in the layout and the building design;*

- take the opportunity to encourage community interaction by creating layouts with a strong neighbourhood focus/centre; larger (300+ unit) schemes will also normally be expected to incorporate a mixed use element;*
- optimises the potential of the site to accommodate development.'*

The Council's adopted Design Guide is a material consideration in the determination of the application. Chapter 9 relates to household extensions. Design Principle DG49 requires extensions to respond to the design of the original dwelling and use simple, uncomplicated building forms to complement and coordinate with the scale, form and massing of the original dwelling.

It is considered that the extension is generally acceptable as it will replace the existing ad hoc development, which has resulted in a collection of unsympathetic alterations to the detriment of the rear of the building and the proposals would remove these and replace them with a two storey extension that provides a more cohesive appearance to the rear elevation. The rear extension is considered to be generally in keeping with the existing dwelling house in terms of design, size and scale and therefore this is felt to be a modest improvement to the existing dwelling, and would conserve the character of the area.

The design of the replacement garage in the rear garden is considered acceptable and while it has a relatively large footprint, the size of the garden is such that a large area of usable garden will remain. This element will conserve the character of the Conservation Area.

The proposal thereby complies with Policy DP26 of the District Plan, the design principles of the Mid Sussex Design Guide, and the provisions of the NPPF.

Impact on the Listed Building and Conservation Area

The application site, Marlow House, is a Grade II listed building dating, from the list description, from the 15th century, located in a prominent position on Lindfield High Street, within the Lindfield Conservation Area.

S.66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

'In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.'

In addition, S.72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

'In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any powers under any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.'

Policy DP34 of the District Plan refers to listed buildings and other heritage assets. It states:

'Listed Buildings

Development will be required to protect listed buildings and their settings. This will be achieved by ensuring that:

- A thorough understanding of the significance of the listed building and its setting has been demonstrated. This will be proportionate to the importance of the building and potential impact of the proposal;*
- Alterations or extensions to a listed building respect its historic form, scale, setting, significance and fabric. Proposals for the conversion or change of use of a listed building retain its significance and character whilst ensuring that the building remains in a viable use;*
- Traditional building materials and construction techniques are normally used. The installation of uPVC windows and doors will not be acceptable;*

- *Satellite antennae, solar panels or other renewable energy installations are not sited in a prominent location, and where possible within the curtilage rather than on the building itself;*
- *Special regard is given to protecting the setting of a listed building;*
- *Where the historic fabric of a building may be affected by alterations or other proposals, the applicant is expected to fund the recording or exploratory opening up of historic fabric.*

Other Heritage Assets

Development that retains buildings which are not listed but are of architectural or historic merit, or which make a significant and positive contribution to the street scene will be permitted in preference to their demolition and redevelopment.

The Council will seek to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the character and quality of life of the District. Significance can be defined as the special interest of a heritage asset, which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic.

Proposals affecting such heritage assets will be considered in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and current Government guidance.'

Policy DP35 of the District Plan requires developments in a conservation area to conserve or enhance its special character, appearance and the range of activities which contribute to it. It sets a number of criteria including that:

'Development in a conservation area will be required to conserve or enhance its special character, appearance and the range of activities which contribute to it. This will be achieved by ensuring that:

- *New buildings and extensions are sensitively designed to reflect the special characteristics of the area in terms of their scale, density, design and through the use of complementary materials;*
- *Open spaces, gardens, landscaping and boundary features that contribute to the special character of the area are protected. Any new landscaping or boundary features are designed to reflect that character;*
- *Traditional shop fronts that are a key feature of the conservation area are protected. Any alterations to shopfronts in a conservation area will only be permitted where they do not result in the loss of a traditional shopfront and the new design is sympathetic to the character of the existing building and street scene in which it is located;*
- *Existing buildings that contribute to the character of the conservation area are protected. Where demolition is permitted, the replacement buildings are of a design that reflects the special characteristics of the area;*
- *Activities such as markets, crafts or other activities which contribute to the special character and appearance of the conservation area are supported;*
- *New pavements, roads and other surfaces reflect the materials and scale of the existing streets and surfaces in the conservation area.*

Development will also protect the setting of the conservation area and in particular views into and out of the area.

New buildings of outstanding or innovative design may be acceptable in conservation areas provided that their impact would not cause material harm to the area.'

The NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Paras 199-202 of the NPPF states:

199. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

200. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;*
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.*

201. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

202. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'

The Council's Conservation Officer has considered the application. In her original comments she raised an objection to several aspects of the application. In particular while she considered that the removal of the existing modern rear extensions was not contentious in principle and that there was scope for replacement, she commented that:

- *the proposal as shown raises concerns in terms of bulk, form, detailed design and materials. At ground floor the footprint of the proposed replacement addition is reduced in comparison to the existing. However, at first floor the extension is both wider and deeper, resulting in increased apparent bulk notwithstanding the reduced roof height- this will be particularly apparent in views from the side, and in particular from the south. The boxy form of the extension with extensive flat roofing will exacerbate this affect, and is unsympathetic to the historic roof form of the building and to the character of the wider area. The elevational treatment, with the recessed balcony with a large glazed opening, and the different facing material at first floor, all serve to further draw attention to the first floor and enhance its undue visual prominence.*
- *The proposed rear addition also raises concerns in terms of its internal layout- one of the more positive features of the existing modern ground and first floor additions is that they exhibit a relatively 'light touch' in terms of the interface with the original rear elevation of the building, which remains visible internally. The proposal shows partitioning to the north eastern corner of the extension adjacent to the original rear elevation to create a pantry and utility at ground floor and a bathroom at first floor. This compartmentation of the space will adversely affect, if not remove, the current appreciation of the height and framing of this part of the rear elevation, an affect which will be compounded by the placement of features such as a shower cubicle against the wall. This aspect of the proposal is also considered to adversely impact the special interest of the proposal and how it is appreciated.*
- *The proposed extension involves the substantial loss of the fabric of the existing c.1830 rear two storey wing, with the internalisation of what little remains. In my opinion, which is broadly consistent with the commentary given within the Heritage Statement, this wing is of historical and architectural interest as an integral part of the 19th century alterations to the property, a key phase in its development, and contributes positively to its narrative. It is also an attractive and characterful feature of the rear elevation, in particular the original window and brickwork. For these reasons I consider that the extensive and destructive works proposed to this element of the building are contentious in principle. I do not consider that the internalisation of the first floor rear façade of the wing as a 'feature' within the bedroom space created will sufficiently preserve its interest.*



JUSTIFICATION

DELEGATED REPORT - APPROVED SCHEME

In regard to the alterations to the bake house the conservation Officer commented:

- The early 19th century bakehouse, originally detached but now linked to the house via the existing ground floor additions, is also considered as significant to the narrative of the building. Although retaining little in the way of internal features of interest, its form (as an originally detached outbuilding), and external character, although altered, remain clearly discernible. The Heritage Statement again appears to raise concerns regarding the impact of the proposals on this part of the building, with which I would agree. The significant loss of fabric from the side and rear elevations with the proposed introduction of large window openings will detract from its character, as would the scale and design of the proposed fenestration. This aspect of the proposal is also therefore considered unacceptable.*
- The proposal to cover the currently exposed framing to the rear elevation to the north of the bakehouse roof is considered potentially contentious- this is one of the few remaining externally exposed areas of the original framing to the building. Its concealment without a very compelling justification, which has not currently been provided, is therefore unlikely to be supported.*

Other concerns include:

- The covering of the exposed framing to the front elevation side return ('niche') is considered potentially contentious for the same reason. This remnant of exposed framing behind the 19th century added façade is an important visual clue to the origins and narrative of the building; its concealment without very compelling justification is likely to be unacceptable.*
- The new window to the southern side elevation appears to punch through the original or early side elevation of the historic core of the building. This point does not seem to be addressed in the Heritage Statement, and it is unclear as to the date or level of interest of the fabric which would be affected. In the absence of evidence to support another conclusion, given the position within the core of the building it is assumed that this work would potentially involve the loss of fabric of interest and is therefore likely to be contentious.*
- The new partitioning within the rear room at ground floor to allow creation of a new WC is also considered, on the basis of the information in front of us, to be contentious.. Subdivision of the room concerned without further, convincing justification is therefore likely to detract from the special interest of the building.*
- At ground floor, the stair which it is proposed to remove appears to be originally 17th century in date, but with much of the fabric replaced at a later date (suggested during our site visit to be 19th century work). Although the survival of 17th century fabric may be fragmentary, any loss of fabric of this date is likely to be contentious, and furthermore the survival of the stair in this position in itself is of interest to the building's narrative. The removal of this stair is therefore considered unacceptable and should be rethought.*
- In association with this work the existing ground to cellar stair appears to be blocked (covered over) at ground floor, leaving no apparent access to the cellar. This may be an error, but it should be addressed. Removal of access to the cellar, an integral part of the building's plan, would be in itself contentious, as would the blocking of the stairwell, which would appear to be in its original or early position. The works to remove the stair enclosure also show the removal of fabric from the original rear elevation of the building to create a wider access into the replaced rear addition- although not specifically addressed by the Heritage Statement this is likely to affect historic fabric and therefore to be contentious.*
- The replacement of the existing steel prop to the room north of the principle chimney stack with an oak post may not be contentious but I would like to see a structural report which explains the need for the prop/post, and if an issue is present, confirms that the solution proposed will be appropriate.*
- At ground floor various works to the flooring are indicated on the proposed plan. More information will be required in respect of these in terms of justification for the works, a detailed description of the nature of the existing flooring, its date and level of interest, and sectional drawings. The impact on the floor structure between ground and basement levels including the impact on the fabric of the ceiling of the basement should be made clear.*
- The removal of the 1830s rear wing at ground floor (and above) is discussed above, as is the partitioning within the ground floor rear extension to its northern side.*

- At first floor, the stair to attic level which it is proposed to remove dates from the 17th century (from the Heritage Statement) and is complete. This structure of a high level of interest and its removal will not be acceptable. It should be retained in situ.*
- The submitted Heritage Statement also refers to the loss of 'the upper part of the chimney flue through the first floor. This does not look to have included the stack and would presumably involve support to the stack somewhere in the eaves line. This would be an immeasurable loss of fabric and, given that this looks to be an early stack and flue and has interrelation with the late crown post roof structure, we would not support this removal.' I am not clear what is referred to here and would welcome clarification on this point. The removal of the added fire surround to the new ensuite/dressing room area is noted and is commented on below.*
- Also at first floor the proposal includes new partitioning within the existing central bedroom to create an ensuite and walk in wardrobe with new and blocked openings and removal of a built out fireplace, and built in wardrobes in various locations. As for the proposed partitioning at ground floor within the historic core of the building the proposed partitioning at first floor is not discussed in detail within the Heritage Statement but again appears to adversely affect the surviving historic plan of the building. The blocking of doorways would also result in no direct access between the southern and northern ends of the building, which will affect how it reads and will be unacceptable. The loss of the fire surround to the northern side of the principle chimney stack requires further clarification as to the date and level of interest of the fabric affected. The complete blocking of the fireplace opening on this side of the chimney is unlikely to be acceptable as without the surround or fireplace there will be no indication from this northern side of the presence of the chimney, or how these rooms were historically heated. The installation of extensive built in wardrobes and in some cases bathroom fittings such as shower enclosures raises potential issues with impact on/obscuring of underlying historic fabric.*
- Room 11 at this level is annotated as a 'plant room/airing cupboard'. More information should be provided as to what this means in practice, in particular the nature, positioning and connections of any new plant.*
- At attic level, the proposed new loft hatch sits in an area just to the north of the principle chimney stack. The submitted heritage statement suggests the survival of 17th century wide plank flooring in this area. More information would be needed regarding the exact location of the proposed hatch and its relationship to this flooring. Any loss of or damage to 17th century fabric, or later fabric of interest, will not be acceptable.*
- More information including sectional elevations will be required in respect of the new wall at attic level. These drawings should highlight the relationship with the existing historic fabric.*
- Subject to considerations of detailed design the proposed new vehicle gates are not considered contentious.*

The conservation officer also considered that, the external works to the rear and the proposed new garage, would be detrimental to the settings of the adjacent listed buildings to either side of the site, particularly perhaps Limes Cottage to the south.

Certain aspects of the proposal are not considered contentious such as the proposal to replace the existing non original front door, and repairs to the surround, the replacement of the cementitious render with lime based render, the replacement of windows and rainwater goods, subject to further information on the date and level of interest of each of the windows concerned. The existing staircase between ground and first floor within the rear addition is modern and is not of any special interest and therefore its replacement is considered acceptable in principle, subject to detail of the replacement design and its interaction with the retained fabric. Similarly subject to considerations of detailed design the proposed new vehicle gates in the rear garden are not considered contentious.

Finally, the Conservation Officer has not objected to the relocation of the garage in the rear garden but has objected to the design of the proposed garage, commenting:

The design as shown, in particular the flat roof form, is not sympathetic to the context, either to the setting of the listed building (and adjacent listed buildings) or to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. I would recommend that the design of the building is amended to a more appropriate hipped or gabled roof which better reflects the predominant roof forms of the surrounding buildings, as well as more traditional facing and roofing materials, and detailing including to the eaves and doors.



JUSTIFICATION

DELEGATED REPORT - APPROVED SCHEME

In light of the above comments, amended plans were provided to address some of the points raised including a reduction in the width and depth of the first floor extension. Following consideration of these, the Conservation Officer has provided the following comments:

Amendments to depth and width of first floor extension.

This aspect of the scheme remains contentious. Unfortunately, although Officers have suggested possible revisions which would address the concerns raised regarding the bulk and form (including the roof form) of the first floor rear addition, which is significantly deeper than the existing extension at this level, these have not been adopted by the applicant and indeed the scheme has reverted to an earlier version with the first floor balcony and privacy screen to the southern side re-instated, adding to the apparent bulk and the undue visual prominence of the extension at this level. For these reasons, this aspect of the proposal is for the reasons previously set out considered to detract from the special architectural and historical interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of this part of the Lindfield Conservation Area.

Amendments to ground floor layout of proposed rear extension.

This aspect of the proposal has not been further amended and as such remains contentious. The proposed partitioning within the ground floor extension adjacent to the northern end of the original rear elevation of the house remains uncomfortably close to this elevation, and detracts from the manner in which this can be appreciated. This is in contrast with the more open layout of the existing extension, which allows one to step back from this elevation and appreciate both the fabric and construction of the historic core of the house, and its original form and footprint. Again, in my opinion this detracts from the special interest of the listed building. Again, suggested amendments to address these concerns have not been fully adopted by the applicant.

Amendments in relation to 1830s rear wing.

No amendments have been made in relation to the proposed work to the fabric of the ground floor of this wing, which it is still proposed to remove almost in its entirety. This is considered to detract from the historic fabric and floorplan of the building, and the narrative of its development over time and how this can be read, and is therefore detrimental to the special interest of the listed building. Although Officers have indicated that a more limited opening up of the ground floor elevations of the wing, guided by a full assessment of the date and level of interest of the affected fabric which it is suggested has been altered in places, might be supported, no further information has been received nor any amendments proposed, and this aspect of the scheme remains unacceptable.

Amendments openings to the west and south sides of the bakehouse.

As previously indicated the scheme has been amended on Officer advice in respect of the proposed alterations to the bakehouse elevations, including new or enlarged openings, which are now considered acceptable subject to detail.

Replacement of the steel prop within the ground floor of the historic core with an oak post, and associated works at basement level.

We have now received the requested further information including a structural report and drawings in connection with these works, which has been seen and commented on by our Building Control team. Further detail would be required by condition if the proposal were recommended for approval, but the principle of this aspect the proposal is not considered contentious.

Works to the flooring at ground floor within the historic core of the building.

In my initial comments in respect of the scheme I noted that: 'At ground floor various works to the flooring are indicated on the proposed plan. More information will be required in respect of these in terms of justification for the works, a detailed description of the nature of the existing flooring, its date and level of interest, and sectional drawings. The impact on the floor structure between ground and basement levels including the impact on the fabric of the ceiling of the basement should be made clear.' This information has not been received- the applicant has referred us back to the information on the ground floor plan as originally submitted, which although it includes a description of the works and indicative proposed sectional detail is not sufficient to establish whether historic fabric will be harmed by the works. In particular, we have no indication of the nature or level of interest of the existing flooring which would be affected by the proposal, which may be of interest, and no detailed existing sections. This aspect of the

proposal therefore has the potential to adversely affect the special interest of the listed building, and is regarded as contentious.

Works at first floor within the historic core of the building.

At first floor concern was previously raised regarding several aspects of the proposal which were considered to adversely affect the special interest of the listed building in terms of its floor plan and fabric. In respect of the blocking of access between the north and south halves of the building, it is noted that the door in question is now marked as retained. This is acceptable, although the door should be retained and locked shut rather than fixed that way- i.e. so that it remains openable. In respect of the other works proposed in the area of the dressing room, we have previously requested further information in respect of the wall which it is now (in the revised scheme) proposed to remove at the western end of the space to open up the existing bathroom as an ensuite WC. This information has not been provided and therefore we are unable to assess whether this aspect of the fabric and floor plan of the building is of interest. It must therefore be assumed that this aspect of the proposal may adversely affect the special interest of the building. The proposed fitted furniture against the north wall of this room is also shown retained despite previous advice that this will obscure and therefore detract from historic fabric. This aspect of the proposal is therefore considered to detract from the special interest of the listed building, as previously noted.

Since these comments were made the applicant has confirmed that the door at first floor within the historic core will be kept locked shut so as to be openable if required. The set of built-in wardrobes have also been omitted from the scheme and an amended plan submitted to show this. Further information on the wall to be removed at first floor in the historic core at the western end of the space, to open up the existing bathroom as an ensuite WC has now been submitted and the conservation Officer now considers that on balance there sufficient information to allow its removal.

The remaining objections of the conservation Officer to the application are noted and it is considered that whilst there will be some benefits from the proposed work in respect of the replacement of the existing rear additions with an improved extension, there will be some limited harms in other areas to the character of the listed building. In terms of the NPPF it is considered that these fall in the category of less than substantial. The NPPF requires a balance to be struck between this less than substantial harm and the public benefits of the proposal. In carrying out this balancing exercise, the less than substantial harm must be afforded significant weight in order to reflect the statutory position that the preservation of listed buildings is desirable.

One of the main area of concerns of the Conservation Officer are the alterations at the rear, although it is recognised that the existing ad hoc development has resulted in a collection of unsympathetic alterations to the detriment of the listed building. The proposals would remove these extensions and replace them with a two storey extension that does provide a more cohesive appearance to the rear of the building. This is considered to be a public benefit as it will improve the listed building compared to its current appearance.

One of the other main concerns of the Conservation Officer is the proposal to form an open plan layout within the 1830's rear wing at ground floor with the removal of most of the walls, as it is considered that this will detract from the historic fabric and floorplan of the building. While it would be preferable for the original layout to remain, this aspect of the proposal has again to be weighed against the overall benefits that the whole of the proposals will bring to the listed building. In addition, these alterations are not in the historic 15th century of the building but within the later addition, albeit the 1830's section, of the building. The alterations to the ground floor will allow the residential use of the building to continue in a more contemporary style. For these reasons this aspect of the proposal is considered acceptable.

While the Conservation Officer also considers that the design of the garage could benefit from a more traditional hipped or gabled roof which better reflects the predominant roof forms of the surrounding buildings, given the proximity to the joint boundary any increase in mass has implications regarding the impact on residential amenity. Furthermore, the garage is set some distance from the main dwelling with screening in the form of a band of mature vegetation to the south of the garage that would effectively divide the garden of the house from the garage and driveway. For these reasons it is considered that the design of the garage in this case is acceptable and the character of the Conservation Area would be conserved.

JUSTIFICATION

DELEGATED REPORT - APPROVED SCHEME

There are other areas of the works proposed where the Conservation Office requires further information such as the works to the flooring at ground floor within the historic core of the building and it is considered that these can be resolved by conditions. In the case of the flooring, the applicant has also requested that as it will require excavation to establish the nature of the existing flooring, that these works can be conditioned. It is considered that this is acceptable and a suitable condition forms part of the recommendation.

The amended plans have addressed some of the original concerns of the Conservation Officer in regard to the impact on the listed building and the setting of the adjoining listed buildings and the conservation area. 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. In view of this it is considered that overall, the scheme is in partial but not full compliance with policy DP34 in the District Plan. There would be some less than substantial harm, which must be afforded significant weight in the planning balance. However in this case it is considered that the public benefits of the scheme, including the improvement to the external appearance of the listed building, outweigh these harms. The replacement garage and external change to the listed building would preserve the character of the Conservation Area, meeting the aims of policy DP35

Neighbouring Amenity

Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design of proposals. Within this there is a requirement that proposals do *'not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, and noise, air and light pollution'*.

Initially officers had concerns regarding the first-floor extension and the potential for it to have a detrimental impact on the outlook of the adjoining property to the south, no.105 High Street, as the first floor projected out further than the existing and it was to extend almost to the boundary. However, the amended plans include a reduction in the width of the extension at first floor by moving it away from the boundary to the south by some 3.5m and it is now considered that there would not be a significant impact on no.105 High Street in regard to loss of outlook.

Due to the orientation, and distance between the main properties, it is considered that the proposed extension would not result in a loss of light or an overbearing nature to the neighbouring amenities. It is noted that while the first floor would extend further than the existing first floor, the ground floor extension would be set further back than the existing extensions at ground floor. Therefore, the ground floor extension is not considered to raise any issues regarding impact on adjoining properties.

The new garage would be located in the rear garden alongside the northern boundary with 109 High Street, set some 1.5m from the boundary, where there is mature vegetation and a brick wall. Given the flat roof structure and orientation of the garage it is considered that that there would not be a significant impact on the adjoining property.

The proposal is thereby considered to comply with Policy DP26 in relation to the residential amenities.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

Planning legislation requires the application to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is therefore necessary for the planning application to be assessed against the policies in the development plan and then to take account of other material planning considerations including the NPPF.

The proposed works are overall considered to be of a design and scale sensitive to the character of the dwelling. There would be some limited harm to the listed building and therefore there would not be full compliance with policy DP34 in the District Plan. However there would also be improvements to the character of the listed building arising from the replacement of the poor quality rear extension. The harm

to the listed building falls in to the category of less than substantial as defined in the NPPF and therefore a balance must be struck between this harm (which should be afforded significant weight) and the public benefits of the proposal. In this case it is considered the benefits of the removal of the poor quality rear addition outweighs the harms.

The proposal would also conserve the character of the Lindfield Conservation Area. In addition, the proposal is not considered to cause detriment to the amenities of the nearby residential neighbouring occupiers. The application therefore complies with Policies DP26 and DP35 of the District Plan, the design principles of the adopted Mid Sussex Design Guide, as well as the requirements of both the NPPF and the Listed Building and Conservation Area (LBCA) Act 1990.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Susan Dubberley



JUSTIFICATION
RELEVANT CORRESPONDENCE

----- Original Message -----
From: "Richard Pocock" <richard@desbruslais.co.uk>
To: "SIMON DOUGALL" <simon.dougall@btinternet.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 21 Feb, 23 At 19:20
Subject: Re: FW: DM/22/3694 and 3695 Marlow House, 104 High Street, Lindfield (GH342)

Good evening Simon,

I have had a look and have provided some quick responses are below within the body of the email. Some of these are adapted from my draft response to Emily.

Do let me know your thoughts.

-Richard

From: Susan Dubberley <Susan.Dubberley@midsussex.gov.uk>
Date: Thursday, 16 February 2023 at 16:16
To: Rob Harrington <rh@gouldbaxter.co.uk>, Matthew Comber <mc@gouldbaxter.co.uk>, Michael Doherty <mjd@gouldbaxter.co.uk>
Subject: FW: DM/22/3694 and 3695 Marlow House, 104 High Street, Lindfield (GH342)

Dear Rob,
Please see Emily’s comments in red in response to your comments in green in the email below. We are still considering the revised drawings and will get back to you shortly regarding these.
Kind Regards

Sue

Sue Dubberley BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI
Senior Planning Officer
Development Management
01444 477590
(Please note I work part-time Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday)

Working together for a better Mid Sussex

How are we doing? We always welcome your [feedback](#)

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

FRONT DOOR by LABC
[Practical advice on home improvements](#)

From: Rob Harrington <rh@gouldbaxter.co.uk>
Sent: 06 February 2023 12:26
To: Susan Dubberley <Susan.Dubberley@midsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: Godfrey Baker <gb@gouldbaxter.co.uk>; Matthew Comber <mc@gouldbaxter.co.uk>; Michael Doherty

<mjd@gouldbaxter.co.uk>; Christine Minney <cm@gouldbaxter.co.uk>

Subject: FW: DM/22/3694 and 3695 Marlow House, 104 High Street, Lindfield (GH342)

Dear Sue,

Re: GH342, Marlow House, Lindfield – Draft response to MSDC Conservation Officer

Further to our recent email correspondence in respect of the above applications at Marlow House, please see below our formal response to Emily's comments (in green). Where appropriate we have supplemented these responses with photographs. I will be issuing the revised drawings by separate email owing to the overall size of the files.

I will be on annual leave from this coming Friday for six days, returning Monday 20th February, so can I please ask that you copy my colleagues Godfrey Baker, Matthew Comber and Michael Doherty into all correspondence. Many thanks.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards,

Rob

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>

Sent: 25 January 2023 10:54

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

Subject: DM/22/3694 and 3695 Marlow House, 104 High Street, Lindfield

Hi Sue,

Comments on the above planning and listed building consent applications.

The application site, Marlow House, is a Grade II listed building dating, from the list description, from the 15th century and located within the Lindfield Conservation Area. To either side of the building are other listed buildings- Everydens to the north is listed Grade II and dates from the 17th century, and Limes Cottage to the south, also Grade II listed, dates from the 16th century. Marlow House would be considered to be within the settings of these buildings.

Towards the rear (western) end of the garden of Marlow House, a three bay garage structure has been commenced but not completed. Planning permission for an oak framed detached garage was granted in 2014. This structure is shown as having timber cladding and a hipped clay tiled roof, but only the base of the walls appears to have been completed.

The current proposal is accompanied by a Heritage Statement. While this contains some useful information on the development and fabric of the building, it does not unfortunately provide a complete analysis of all relevant areas. It is also somewhat confused in that it appears to discuss works which may not form part of the current proposals- possibly the scheme has been revised prior to submission of the current applications but the Statement has not been fully updated? In any case although the Statement is partly useful, these factors do prevent it from providing the full and clear information which would ideally be required for an informed consideration of the proposal. The Statement does not appear to have been based on a fully comprehensive historic building survey, which I would recommend for works of the extent now proposed (see below).

The current proposal is for extensive works to the building internally and externally, and within its setting, including:

- Demolition of existing part one, part two storey rear extensions
- Construction of a new flat roofed two storey addition at the rear incorporating parts of a two storey rear addition dating from c.1830. The extension as shown sits over a reduced footprint at ground floor compared to existing, but projects further back at first floor, albeit at a reduced height. The structure is flat roofed with brick to the ground floor and timber cladding at first, with some elements of metal cladding, and large Crittall style windows. At first floor is a recessed balcony with bronze metal railings. The ground floor is also recessed to create a porch. An existing chimney to the south side elevation is proposed to be extended up to accommodate the height of the new extension at this point.
- Internal and external alterations to the exiting single storey bakehouse including extensive alterations to the internal layout, and new fenestration and doors to the rear (west) and side (south) elevations.
- To the original rear elevation, where it is exposed to the north of the bakehouse roof, it is proposed to cover the currently exposed timber framing with timber battens and dressed lead.
- To the front elevation side return (described as a niche to the southern end of the elevation) it is proposed to extend the weatherboarding currently in place at first floor downwards to cover timber framing exposed at ground floor.
- Also to the front elevation it is proposed to replace the existing non original front door with a part glazed four panel door, with repairs to the timber surround and porch hood.

- It is also proposed to replace the existing cementitious render to the front elevation with a lime render.
- All the windows to the front elevation are proposed to be replaced with new single glazed timber framed windows. Rainwater goods are to be replaced with cast metal goods.
- A new window opening is proposed to the southern side elevation towards the rear of the historic core of the building, in association with formation of a new WC internally.
- Internally, a number of alterations are proposed at ground floor including new partitioning within the rear room at ground floor to allow creation of a new WC, removal of the existing retained blocked stair between ground and first floor within the core of the building, replacement of an existing steel prop within the northern room at ground floor with an oak post, reconfiguration at the rear ground floor including substantial removal of the surviving fabric to the 1830s rear addition, and new partitioning adjacent to the northern end of the original rear elevation, within the replacement extension, and a replacement staircase between ground and first floor within the rear extension.
- At first floor internally various works are proposed including within the historic core the removal of the existing staircase between first floor and attic level, new partitioning within the existing central bedroom to create an ensuite and walk in wardrobe with new and blocked openings and removal of a built out fireplace, built in wardrobes in various locations. Towards the rear of the building the substantial removal of the 1830s rear wing is proposed with only part of the rear wall retained internally within the new extension
- At attic level a new wall is proposed to separate the vaulted ceiling of the bedroom to the southern end of the building from the attic space. A new loft hatch is proposed between the existing joists.
- Demolition of the existing part built garage to the rear of the garden and construction in a different position of a flat roofed three bay garage with log store, with associated hard landscaping works.
- New timber gates to the rear vehicle access from Hickmans Lane.

To consider each of these elements in turn:

- The existing rear extensions are modern in date- their removal is not considered contentious in principle. This is positive to note, particularly as they have resulted in a somewhat disjointed appearance. Access is also difficult for maintenance and cleaning.
- Although I do think there is scope for the replacement/reconfiguration of the existing rear additions, the proposal as shown raises concerns in terms of bulk, form, detailed design and materials. At ground floor the footprint of the proposed replacement addition is reduced in comparison to the existing. However, at first floor the extension is both wider and deeper, resulting in increased apparent bulk notwithstanding the reduced roof height- this will be particularly apparent in views from the side, and in particular from the south. The boxy form of the extension with extensive flat roofing will exacerbate this affect, and is unsympathetic to the historic roof form of the building and to the character of the wider area. The elevational treatment, with the recessed balcony with a large glazed opening, and the different facing material at first floor, all serve to further draw attention to the first floor and enhance its undue visual prominence.
- The design approach that has been adopted is akin that adopted for other listed building extensions that he have been involved with. The above commentary on the design fails to account for the current absence of visibility of the original portion of the property, which has been concealed by the construction of the C21 extensions which, in conjunction with the conservatory extension, also subsumed the Bakehouse structure. The original rear elevation of the building remains visible in part from the interior of the existing extensions, a point which is discussed in relation to the internal layout of the proposed replacement additions. The scale of the existing additions is noted and was taken into account in framing my original comments on the proposed replacement extensions. I have also commented in respect of the currently proposed alterations to the bakehouse- whilst the existing additions may not be ideal in their relationship with this structure I remain of the opinion that the proposed loss of fabric/design of the fenestration in respect of the proposal as submitted will be further damaging to its character.

The design, as it currently stands, is of minimal impact. Suitable differentiation has been made between the bakehouse and the extension/original building. There is no internal loss of fabric and the fenestration merely allows for updated use. There is still plenty of external brickwork left.

The proposed design reveals a greater amount of the original building, reducing its massing to demonstrate subservience thereby making it more legible and undoing the harm caused by the

unsympathetic C21 extensions. A similar example of a timber-clad extension to a listed building is highlighted in the accompanying planning statement, which received praise for how it successfully combined the old with the new.

See above. In my opinion the additional bulk at first floor as shown in the original submission is damaging to the relationship between the historic core of the building and the rear additions to it. I note this has been somewhat amended in the revised drawings and will comment on this separately.

Let us see what is said next

The rear of the property is not clearly visible from the public realm, so its ‘visual prominence’ would only be seen from the neighbouring gardens and upper level windows of the surrounding properties. This aspect is dealt with in a later response

Public views of a listed building will not be the only or main consideration in assessing an application for listed building consent.

It must be noted that both adjoining neighbours have written letters of support, the likes of which we rarely see, demonstrating the positive impact the proposals will have on their surroundings. Furthermore, I recently forwarded an extract of the comments made by the Lindfield Preservation Society, which I will repeat here:

*‘We think you’ve made a strong application that would produce a very welcome restoration of an historic house. Given the serious approach of your architects, I’m sure that you’ll be able to arrive at agreement with the council on details of the heritage aspect.
The Society does make conservation and design awards at our AGM each April. These are meant to recognise owners, architects and builders who preserve and enhance the character of our built environment. I hope that in due course your ambitious project will be a candidate for one of these awards.’*
The comments made in respect of the design are therefore at odds with the prevailing opinion.
The support of the Lindfield Preservation Society is noted but does not alter my own professional opinion on the merits of the scheme as submitted.

Ignoring local support for a scheme is potentially dangerous and citing professional opinion over such groups can both cause dissent and also lead to loss of confidence at a local level. In this case, the level of support is such that it may be put forward for an award. I would argue that more weight should be given to their comments, rather than what comes across as wilful dismissal.

However, In light of these comments we have amended the scheme by reducing the depth and width of the first floor addition, providing it with a subservient and lightweight appearance. This will allow the Victorian element to remain visible as has been requested. The shower cubicle has been omitted from the main En Suite to overcome the comment regarding its placement against the existing wall, while the first floor of the Victorian element is wholly allocated as a Dressing Room.

As above I will comment separately on the amended scheme.

- The proposed rear addition also raises concerns in terms of its internal layout- one of the more positive features of the existing modern ground and first floor additions is that they exhibit a relatively ‘light touch’ in terms of the interface with the original rear elevation of the building, which remains visible internally. The proposal shows partitioning to the north eastern corner of the extension adjacent to the original rear elevation to create a pantry and utility at ground floor and a bathroom at first floor. This compartmentation of the space will adversely affect, if not remove, the current appreciation of the height and framing of this part of the rear elevation, an affect which will be compounded by the placement of

features such as a shower cubicle against the wall. This aspect of the proposal is also considered to adversely impact the special interest of the proposal and how it is appreciated.

- The creation of a Utility and Pantry in this area is considered to be the most appropriate location for these rooms. However, the proposals are shown adjusted to form a wine cellar room adjacent to the original rear wall, the separating wall stopping short of the original wall to enable it to remain visible. Combined with the retention of the existing internal windows (replaced in Crittall frames), the visibility of the wall remains intact. The revision to the first floor layout omits a shower cubicle from the main En-suite so no existing elements are affected.
I will comment on the revised scheme separately.
- The proposed extension involves the substantial loss of the fabric of the existing c.1830 rear two storey wing, with the internalisation of what little remains. In my opinion, which is broadly consistent with the commentary given within the Heritage Statement, this wing is of historical and architectural interest as an integral part of the 19th century alterations to the property, a key phase in its development, and contributes positively to its narrative. It is also an attractive and characterful feature of the rear elevation, in particular the original window and brickwork. For these reasons I consider that the extensive and destructive works proposed to this element of the building are contentious in principle. I do not consider that the internalisation of the first floor rear façade of the wing as a ‘feature’ within the bedroom space created will sufficiently preserve its interest.
- As explained above, the proposals will be amended to retain this portion of the building and allow it to remain visible.
As above I will comment separately on the revised scheme.
- The early 19th century bakehouse, originally detached but now linked to the house via the existing ground floor additions, is also considered as significant to the narrative of the building. Although retaining little in the way of internal features of interest, its form (as an originally detached outbuilding), and external character, although altered, remain clearly discernible. The Heritage Statement again appears to raise concerns regarding the impact of the proposals on this part of the building, with which I would agree. The significant loss of fabric from the side and rear elevations with the proposed introduction of large window openings will detract from its character, as would the scale and design of the proposed fenestration. This aspect of the proposal is also therefore considered unacceptable.
- The remarks on page 28 of the heritage statement state:

‘The bakehouse is now to be retained in situ, but with the insertion of French doors to the flank. The retention of the unit is to be commended. The insertion of the doors is of minimal disruption – especially when compared to the fact that there was never any internal material left over from the early 2000s alterations to make any assessment of interior fabric.’

The proposals for the Bakehouse are supported in the heritage statement and the loss of fabric is not considered contentious. However, as part of the proposed revisions to the scheme we will reduce the width of the glazed opening in the south elevation. The internal door opening is formed within an existing opening, thus not requiring existing fabric to be removed.

I would refer the applicant to part 9.0 of their Heritage Statement which considers the alterations to the bakehouse and two storey 1830s addition and states in relation to the former: *‘Furthermore, the design as it stands, does not seek to particularly differentiate the Bake House element and subsumes what is left of it into the whole. The Bake House has been a semi-detached unit since built and the present rear extension still denotes this separation and allows one to appreciate it as a structure. This presently would be lost within the feasibility design.’* Whether this statement is referring the application as submitted or to an earlier version of it I am not sure, but the tone of this section of the report is not, in my reading of it, entirely positive in terms of the impact of the current proposals. I did also note the inclusion of the paragraph quoted by the applicant above, and this is one reason why I feel that the Statement is in places contradictory (see also below). Notwithstanding this, I have formed my own opinions in relation to the impact of the works on the bakehouse, which are contained in my previous comments.

The statement is clear enough - she merely needs to read it properly. It is not contradictory, but does deal with a scheme that has developed during the course of preparation of the report and as a consequence of things arising from the report - which is good practice.

- The proposal to cover the currently exposed framing to the rear elevation to the north of the bakehouse roof is considered potentially contentious- this is one of the few remaining externally exposed areas of the original framing to the building. Its concealment without a very compelling justification, which has not currently been provided, is therefore unlikely to be supported.
- We will remove this item from the proposed works.
Noted.
- The covering of the exposed framing to the front elevation side return ('niche') is considered potentially contentious for the same reason. This remnant of exposed framing behind the 19th century added façade is an important visual clue to the origins and narrative of the building; its concealment without very compelling justification is likely to be unacceptable.
- We will remove this item from the proposed works.
Noted.
- The proposal to replace the existing non original front door, and repairs to the surround, are not considered contentious subject to detail.
- This is welcomed, and a condition relating to the detailing of the front door would be an acceptable outcome.
- Likewise the replacement of the cementitious render with lime based render is not considered contentious subject to detail.
- This is welcomed also, and further demonstrates the Applicant's intention to sympathetically upgrade the property to 'undo' works that have previously been carried in an unsympathetic manner.
- Ditto the windows and rainwater goods, expect where windows may be of historic interest- for example the lancet window to the 1830's rear addition (although its not clear whether this is included in the proposed replacement scheme). We may need more information on the date and level of interest of each of the windows concerned.
- The existing timber-framed window does not fulfil the technical definition of a lancet window, with the tops of the opening casements shaped to mimic a lancet. As discussed above, the Victorian element will be retained and remain visible, with its existing window retained likewise.

The remaining windows will be subject to joinery details being provided, and such an aspect can be dealt with by condition if deemed appropriate.

I have taken the term 'lancet window' from the applicant's own heritage statement (p.25). I am aware it is not technically accurate but have reused the terminology out of courtesy and for ease of reference. Although if acceptable in principle detail of replacement windows could potentially be required by condition, we may require a more detailed analysis of the date, level of interest and state of repair of each affected window to establish whether that replacement is acceptable and justified.

My term was merely descriptive of the casement design - it is obviously not a lancet window. Perhaps I should have used inverted commas more. The window can be looked at in more detail, but it is not likely to be of significant heritage value. It is not contemporary with the wing.

- The new window to the southern side elevation appears to punch through the original or early side elevation of the historic core of the building. This point does not seem to be addressed in the Heritage Statement, and it is unclear as to the date or level of interest of the fabric which would be affected. In the absence of evidence to support another conclusion, given the position within the core of the building it is assumed that this work would potentially involve the loss of fabric of interest and is therefore likely to be contentious.
- Since the previous occupant left the building, the removal of their hoarded items and furniture has revealed the presence of an existing window in this location – see Image 1 of the attached PDF.

The retention of this window opening, by virtue of it being there already, is therefore acceptable.

In that case the applicant's existing drawings should be amended to show this window.

- The new partitioning within the rear room at ground floor to allow creation of a new WC is also considered, on the basis of the information in front of us, to be contentious. Although not directly addressed by the Heritage Statement, which does not contain (as many such statements will do) indicative developmental plans, it would appear that this southern bay of the building is in an original or early layout. Subdivision of the room concerned without further, convincing justification is therefore likely to detract from the special interest of the building.
- This aspect of the proposal will be omitted, retaining the existing proportions of the room.
Noted.
- At ground floor, the stair which it is proposed to remove appears to be originally 17th century in date, but with much of the fabric replaced at a later date (suggested during our site visit to be 19th century work). Although the survival of 17th century fabric may be fragmentary, any loss of fabric of this date is likely to be contentious, and furthermore the survival of the stair in this position in itself is of interest to the building's narrative. The removal of this stair is therefore considered unacceptable and should be rethought.
- This comment is noted and the proposals will be revised to show the stairs retained. However, this contradicts the comments made on site which agreed this stair could be removed and it would be appreciated to understand why the original opinion has changed.
It is noted that the stair will be retained. I am afraid the writer has misremembered or misunderstood the comments made on site, which were that the staircase should be retained. At the time I was not speaking to Mr Harrington so it is possibly for this reason that a misunderstanding has occurred.
- In association with this work the existing ground to cellar stair appears to be blocked (covered over) at ground floor, leaving no apparent access to the cellar. This may be an error, but it should be addressed. Removal of access to the cellar, an integral part of the building's plan, would be in itself contentious, as would the blocking of the stairwell, which would appear to be in its original or early position. The works to remove the stair enclosure also show the removal of fabric from the original rear elevation of the building to create a wider access into the replaced rear addition- although not specifically addressed by the Heritage Statement this is likely to affect historic fabric and therefore to be contentious.
- The existing staircase will be retained, thus addressing this concern. However, within the drawing key for the ground floor plan, item 6 states: 'Existing staircase to be removed. New trap hatch within floor to serve existing steps into the Cellar'. The original proposals did not obstruct the stairs to deny access into the Cellar.
It is noted that the cellar staircase will be retained. A trap hatch would still be regarded as an effective blocking of the staircase and would not be regarded as acceptable.

I would argue that Emily should be in a position to assist with comment on what she would find acceptable in this instance - working with the design team..

- The replacement of the existing steel prop to the room north of the principle chimney stack with an oak post may not be contentious but I would like to see a structural report which explains the need for the prop/post, and if an issue is present, confirms that the solution proposed will be appropriate.
- The existing steel post and adjacent acro prop were in situ when the Applicants purchased the property, and are led to believe that the acro prop was even in situ when the previous owner purchased the property. It is clearly evident from the arrangement of the existing beams that would have been installed to replace a post – likely to have been timber. The steel post and acro prop are supported on a masonry nib within the cellar. The proposals therefore seek to replace these items with a single oak post more in keeping with the existing building and akin to what would have originally been present, thereby providing support for the cross-beams over. A structural engineer has already been appointed and they have confirmed the need for the post; a solution for this will be prepared. Refer to image 2 of the attached PDF.
As per my original comments there may not be an in principle objection to this aspect of the proposal but the works require justification. I note that a structural engineer has been appointed so we will await his/her report.

The necessity of the works do not in any sense require justification. They are necessary due to the structural condition of the building which is always of justification in itself. However, what is required is the design and this element would certainly need to be justified. All that would be needed here is for Emily to request the eventual design for review. Hopefully, this will now be the case.

- At ground floor various works to the flooring are indicated on the proposed plan. More information will be required in respect of these in terms of justification for the works, a detailed description of the nature of the existing flooring, its date and level of interest, and sectional drawings. The impact on the floor structure

between ground and basement levels including the impact on the fabric of the ceiling of the basement should be made clear.

- Sectional drawings of the proposed flooring have been submitted with the planning and LBC application, so the proposals are very clear to see. The timber floor joists over the cellar would have been clearly visible during your site visit, with all thermal insulation to be laid between the joists from the underside. The existing floorboards, currently concealed from above with a vinyl floor covering (see above image), are a mixture of ages but in the main are modern pine boards laid over modern timber floor joists. Refer to image 3 on the attached PDF.
- The proposal also includes the removal of the existing parquet flooring and the replacement of the existing solid floor with a breathable limecrete slab. Since it will require work to lift these blocks and assess the floor structure beneath, we would request that this element be made a condition of the approval to enable the invasive investigations to occur. One must appreciate that there are elements of the building for which a solution cannot be fully determined until a level of intrusive investigation has occurred. Indeed, the heritage statement remarks:

'The solid floor areas will involve the removal of the present floor. We are not able to confirm what the present floor is towards the front of the property, but with previous works to the house, it is very much suspected to be a modern concrete floor and not a heritage floor of any sort. Nonetheless, assessment of the floor structure to the front of the building in the present dining room should be double checked to ensure that there is not something there to be considered for retention.'

The further information is noted.

- The removal of the 1830s rear wing at ground floor (and above) is discussed above, as is the partitioning within the ground floor rear extension to its northern side.
- See comments above.
I will comment separately on the revisions to the scheme.
- The existing staircase between ground and first floor within the rear addition is modern and is not of any special interest. Its replacement is not considered contentious in principle, subject to detail of the replacement design and its interaction with the retained fabric.
- At first floor, the stair to attic level which it is proposed to remove dates from the 17th century (from the Heritage Statement) and is complete. This structure of a high level of interest and its removal will not be acceptable. It should be retained in situ.
- This comment is noted and the existing staircase will be retained. This item is therefore addressed.
Noted.
- The submitted Heritage Statement also refers to the loss of *'the upper part of the chimney flue through the first floor. This does not look to have included the stack and would presumably involve support to the stack somewhere in the eaves line. This would be an immeasurable loss of fabric and, given that this looks to be an early stack and flue and has interrelation with the late crown post roof structure, we would not support this removal.'* I am not clear what is referred to here and would welcome clarification on this point. The removal of the added fire surround to the new ensuite/dressing room area is noted and is commented on below.
- The chimney stack will be retained at its current height.
Noted.
- Also at first floor the proposal includes new partitioning within the existing central bedroom to create an ensuite and walk in wardrobe with new and blocked openings and removal of a built out fireplace, and built in wardrobes in various locations. As for the proposed partitioning at ground floor within the historic core of the building the proposed partitioning at first floor is not discussed in detail within the Heritage Statement but again appears to adversely affect the surviving historic plan of the building. The blocking of doorways would also result in no direct access between the southern and northern ends of the building, which will affect how it reads and will be unacceptable. The loss of the fire surround to the northern side of the principle chimney stack requires further clarification as to the date and level of interest of the fabric affected. The complete blocking of the fireplace opening on this side of the chimney is unlikely to be acceptable as without the surround or fireplace there will be no indication from this northern side of the presence of the chimney, or how these rooms were historically heated. The installation of extensive built in

wardrobes and in some cases bathroom fittings such as shower enclosures raises potential issues with impact on/obscuring of underlying historic fabric.

- The proposed shower room arrangement will be reconfigured to utilise the existing vented drainage stack, and will utilise a portion of the shower room that already exists. The principle of installing sanitaryware should not therefore be in any way contentious. The space will be amended to remain open and retain the existing fireplace, which again will overcome the objections to those aspects. The blocking up of the existing door openings is simply to fix them shut, not fill them in, the principle of which is perfectly acceptable in conservation terms as it is easily reversible. The Applicants can use the main landing to access the other side of the building, appreciating the original rear wall as they do so.

It is not considered in any way helpful or fair to deny the Applicants the ability to provide wardrobe storage for their clothing. These are elements that can be dealt with by condition if deemed absolutely necessary.

I will comment separately on the proposed revisions to the floor plan. Whilst of course I would not wish to deny the applicants appropriate storage this must be achieved in a manner which is sympathetic to the special interest of the listed building. Extensive fitted cupboards within the historic core of the building may not be an acceptable solution where there is an undesirable impact on underlying historic fabric, which could include covering over and concealing elements of interest such as currently exposed timber framing. This comment remains relevant and further information should be provided during the course of the application- it will not be appropriate to deal with this by condition as the principle of the acceptability of the fitted furniture as shown has not been established.

The covering of framing is not considered of concern, indeed I am aware of a large number of schemes where insulation has been upgraded in recent times that entirely covers framing elements. The covering of framing reason alone is by no means a reason to refuse storage. The only valid reason for refusal of this element would be how the cupboards are fitted - whether they cut into, or remove fabric etc. by virtue of their intrinsic design. In my view, this could be dealt with by Condition, as the condition could require that fixings are appropriately non-invasive and involve no loss of fabric.

- Room 11 at this level is annotated as a 'plant room/airing cupboard'. More information should be provided as to what this means in practice, in particular the nature, positioning and connections of any new plant.
- A change in layout on the first floor will be necessary to overcome other comments, with this room omitted. The heating plant will be located within the existing attic space to minimise its impact.
Noted- in that case we will need similar information in terms of the plant to be located within the attic space, which is also within the core of the building and contains historic fabric of interest.

It depends where in the attic and how. Emily is correct to highlight that this area is of particular importance and, indeed, my report also highlights this area of the house.

- At attic level, the proposed new loft hatch sits in an area just to the north of the principle chimney stack. The submitted heritage statement suggests the survival of 17th century wide plank flooring in this area. More information would be needed regarding the exact location of the proposed hatch and its relationship to this flooring. Any loss of or damage to 17th century fabric, or later fabric of interest, will not be acceptable.
- As noted above, the staircase will be retained and therefore no loft hatch will be required. This item is therefore addressed.
Noted.
- More information including sectional elevations will be required in respect of the new wall at attic level. These drawings should highlight the relationship with the existing historic fabric.
- As noted above, the staircase will be retained and therefore no new attic wall will be required. This item is therefore addressed.
Noted.
- In respect of the garage, the proposal is to resite the building to the northern side of the garden, with the existing part built structure removed. The proposed new garage is shown as a contemporary style building with a flat green roof and vertical timber cladding. Whilst I would not consider there to be an in principle objection to the resiting of the garage building, the design as shown, in particular the flat roof form, is not

sympathetic to the context, either to the setting of the listed building (and adjacent listed buildings) or to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. I would recommend that the design of the building is amended to a more appropriate hipped or gabled roof which better reflects the predominant roof forms of the surrounding buildings, as well as more traditional facing and roofing materials, and detailing including to the eaves and doors.

- We strongly refute these comments and argue that the proposal is very much sympathetic to its context. The flat roof form, with its living roof as a biodiversity feature, respects its setting within the garden of the host property and the setting of the garden to 109 High Street to the north, ensuring it remains very much subservient to the surrounding properties. Indeed, the neighbours at No. 109 have written a very positive letter in support of the proposals, including the garage element which they are very happy with. It should be noted that the garage to No. 109 also features a flat roof, which ensures it remains subservient and respectful to the listed building and its wider setting. The impact of the proposed garage on the wider setting of the Conservation Area is discussed below.

I note the points made but these do not alter my opinion on the merits of this aspect of the proposal. I am not sure of the date of construction of the garage to no. 109 but I note that it appears to have been already in place in 1985 when a temporary consent was granted for its use as a furniture restoration workshop. It therefore appears to have been of some age, and if planning permission was sought for its construction this appears to have been outside the current policy context. I would not regard this as a precedent for the development now under consideration.

The policy context is somewhat irrelevant - whether there is, or is not a flat roofed modern structure nearby neither sets a precedent, nor denies one - especially if it has been around a while. Consideration must primarily be on up to date planning principles and the context into which the building is to be set. The present design is suitably subservient and follows modern principles in respect of bio-diversity and modular form/size. Whilst a hipped and gabled form, with other finish alterations may render the scheme slightly more 'traditional', it could be argued that the design could become close to pastiche - something that is not considered good practice by HE. It is preferred that suitable differentiation is given between the old and the new and the present green roofed design will merely be seen for what it is. Personally, I would have no significant concerns over the design, especially given its position on the plot.

- Subject to considerations of detailed design the proposed new vehicle gates are not considered contentious.
- This is positive to note; the design has been carefully considered to respect the Conservation Area.

In summary, although I do think there is scope here for replacement or reconfiguration of the rear extensions, and possibly for some, more limited, alterations within the historic core, significant aspects of the current proposals are considered unacceptable in terms of their impact on the special historical and architectural interest of the listed building. This is due to impact on the historic fabric and plan form of the building, and how these are appreciated, as well as impact on the appearance of the building, particularly from the rear, and including the surviving 19th century rear addition and bakehouse. This will be contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. In terms of the NPPF I would consider the harm caused to be less than substantial, but at the high end of that scale. Paragraph 202 will apply.

I would also consider aspects of the proposal, in particular the external works to the rear and the proposed new garage, to be detrimental to the settings of the adjacent listed buildings to either side of the site, particularly perhaps Limes Cottage to the south. This will again be contrary to District Plan Policy DP34. In terms of the NPPF I would regard the harm caused as less than substantial, at the mid range of the scale. Paragraph 202 will again apply.

As explained above, the comments made in respect of the appearance of the garage are strongly refuted. On the contrary, the neighbours on both sides have written to MSDC in support of the proposals. The external works aspect of the scheme has only been referred to in respect of the new wall and gates, which are considered acceptable. No reference has been made elsewhere to the proposed external works so this appears to be something of a throwaway remark. The provision of a garage in the position shown is not being disputed, nor are the proposed driveway and gates, so it follows that a driveway connecting the two is considered acceptable. The driveway would be surfaced in a crushed stone finish that is in keeping with its Conservation Area setting.

The external works referred to would include the external works to the building itself, which will impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the settings of the adjacent listed buildings, as well as on Marlow House itself. My previous comments included an appropriately detailed analysis of these external alterations.

Emily's comments need more justification here. She has not explained how and to what extent, apart from a 'mid range' comment which is not clarified. The initial response feels rather 'standard paragraph'. The follow up seeks to

mitigate this with a generalised requirement for 'more information', though I note that the scheme has a sufficient level of design information at this present time. More clarification and justification would be needed here.

The photograph below shows the neighbouring property's driveway finished with block paving and its garage in the background.

The proposal will also detract from the character and appearance of the Lindfield Conservation Area, contrary to the requirements of DP35 and causing a mid level of less than substantial harm.

The works to the front of the property will only serve to enhance its appearance through sensitively-undertaken repair and replacement, ensuring the preservation and enhancement of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Owing to the nature of the site and the depth of its rear garden, the rear aspect of the property is **not visible from the public realm**, as can be seen from image 4 on the attached PDF (taken 27th January 2023). Image 5 on the attached PDF is taken from Hickmans Lane looking north towards the location of the proposed garage building. You will note the spire of All Saints Church in the distance, the view towards which will be preserved by the proposed flat roof.

Works do not have to be visible from the public realm to affect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Views within the site and from neighbouring properties, including both their gardens and the upper windows of buildings, are also a relevant consideration.

Whilst this is true, views from within the immediate site become very contentious, as the end result can be subjective and based often upon the viewer's like, or dislike of modern materials, designs and finishes (regardless of HE policy). As there is support from the neighbouring properties, the weight of onus in this case is further reduced.

It is unfortunate that the applicants did not seek pre-application advice prior to the submission of this proposal, as it is my opinion that there is scope in principle for works to replace or reconfigure the existing rear additions. In light of this it would be my recommendation that the current application is withdrawn and a pre-application discussion is entered into, before submission of a revised scheme. I would also suggest that any revised scheme would benefit from being based on, and guided by, a fully detailed historic building survey, ideally undertaken by a historic building archaeologist, so that the origins and development of the building are fully understood and that the Heritage Statement accompanying any future application can include a greater level of detail to inform consideration of the proposals.

The first sentence of this paragraph infers that the Applicant's have been incorrectly advised. Our experience of the pre-application process with MSDC, and in particular relating to listed building proposals, is that it rarely allows for an informed and detailed discussion on the finer points of a scheme. This becomes even more noticeable when we compare it with the advice we receive from neighbouring LPAs in respect of LBC proposals. Only by submitting a detailed planning application are we assured that detailed comments will be received, with these being received sooner than if one had pursued the pre-application route.

The comments in respect of the content and depth of the historic building report are for the heritage consultant to rebut, but the reader is made aware that the author of the report is an experienced and qualified surveyor from an established practice. It is noted that the Conservation Officer has placed great emphasis on the report's content where it supports a negative stance, while at the same time deriding it for lacking information. The comments are considered unfairly derogatory towards the author of the historic building report.

This does not in any way reflect my experience of the provision of pre-application advice for MSDC. In my own experience, the advice we provide is clear and detailed, although of course the level of detail will depend on that of the pre-application submission- we can only respond to the information in front of us.

It was not my intention to be in anyway derogatory towards the author of the historic building report, however if we do not have in every respect sufficient information to allow an informed understanding of the proposal this needs to be pointed out, as per the requirements of paragraph 194 of the NPPF, so that the relevant further information can be provided. As above, the report is in places contradictory, possibly for the reason I gave in my previous comments. It would be helpful, for clarity, if references to any previous version of the scheme could be removed.

As I have said before, my report merely needs to be read in context. It does not seem to have confused any other reader. Nor has the context of the scheme being seen to be critically appraised and then altered in light of my professional advice been acknowledged. There are always points to clarify in more complex schemes and my experience is that a quick chat through or email can usually provide all the information needed from our end and, indeed, if there is further information that is requested at CO level we would endeavour to provide it. This is something that I have had experience of with a number of local authorities recently - Surrey, Lewes and Eastbourne, Wealden to name a few. It is a shame that Emily has not taken the opportunity to contact me directly and seek to gain some insight into the scheme, or to understand the building better and see how the scheme

developed following my advice to the architect. I am also concerned about what is meant by 'appropriate level of detail'. Whilst HE guidance is admittedly vague on this point, leaving it somewhat to the discretion of the reader, Emily has stated that she would have expected a full historic building survey/recording for this building upon which to base the heritage statement. These are increasingly available, but still rare on standard listed buildings. Their cost and time to produce usually significantly outweighs the information provided in respect of understanding the building (in context to a scheme). Much of the information arising out of these surveys, whilst interesting to historians and local history groups, is rarely directly relevant to whether a scheme is acceptable or not. In this case, the vast majority of the works are outside the main historic core and the architect has retracted the main contentious elements internally now in any case. It is very doubtful that such a largescale survey would now be appropriate and sets a somewhat worrying trend (that has been noted within other LAs) where the cost burden for the provision of such surveys is being passed to the building owner to supplement the knowledge base of the LA. It also poses questions about the level of direct historic building architectural knowledge that is presently within LA planning and CO departments. Doubtless, this is an interesting building that warrants further study, but this extended study is not at a level relevant to the proposed scheme in my view.

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 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.

--
Richard Pocock BA Hons. MSc (Building Rehabilitation and Conservation) MRICS FRSPH
Associate Director

Built Heritage Specialist

07430 771756

DESBRUSLAIS CHARTERED SURVEYORS

01273 495984 or 020 7101 9735



www.desbruslais.co.uk Regulated by the RICS

Information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the person to whom it is addressed. Access and/or use by others is unauthorised and may be unlawful. If you receive this mail in error please notify the sender and delete the message from your system immediately.

Desbruslais Ltd. Registered office The Old Sawmill, Copyhold Lane, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex RH16 1XT Reg. No. 6828374

[WARNING]: This email originated from outside of the organisation

JUSTIFICATION
SUSSEX HERITAGE TRUST AWARD

Upon the completion, Marlow House received the ‘Small Scale Residential Award: Restoration and Extension’ from Sussex Heritage Trust Awards 2025.

Judges’ Comments:

*‘Small Scale:
A superb scheme that has completely revitalised a 15th century house and there was a brilliant blend of old and new. The workmanship and detailing was of a very high order. It was obvious that the client and contractor had a good working relationship in producing an excellent scheme. The landscaping was exemplary. The use of traditional materials and skills was very encouraging.*

*Building Craft
The workmanship was of a high order. Attention to detail was exemplary. There were no square corners in the plastering, but wonderfully executive round corners which greatly enhanced the overall appearance. Roy Quayle worked well with the client to produce a scheme with a real wow factor! ‘*



Sussex Heritage Trust Awwards 2025, photograph from the Applicant’s collection





Studio Kyson
28 Scrutton Street
London
EC2A 4RP

020 7247 2462
www.kyson.co.uk

© 2025 Kyson