



LONDON OFFICE

Ms Susan Dubberley
Mid Sussex District Council
Oaklands Road
Haywards Heath
RH16 1SS

Direct Dial: 0207 973 3627

Our ref: P01602124; L01602122

2nd February 2026

Dear Ms Dubberley

**Arrangements for Handling Heritage Applications Direction 2015
& T&CP (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015
& Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990**

**MARLOW HOUSE, 107 HIGH STREET, LINDFIELD, HAYWARDS HEATH, WEST
SUSSEX RH16 2HR
Applications Nos DM/25/3131; DM/25/3132**

Thank you for your letter of 10th December 2025 regarding the above applications for planning permission and listed building consent. On the basis of the information available to date, we offer the following advice to assist your authority in determining the applications.

Introduction

The current submission follows the planning and listed building consent applications for internal and external alterations submitted in December 2022, which were granted consent on 12th May 2023 (planning ref: DM/22/3694, DM/22/3695).

However, several of the works undertaken were not carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

To regularise these works, part-retrospective, part-new planning permission and listed building applications were submitted in April 2025 and subsequently revised in September in an attempt to address concerns raised by your Council's Conservation Officer (planning ref: DM/25/1103; DM/25/1104). Historic England provided consultation response to the listed building consent application on 23rd October 2025, objecting to the proposals (HE ref: L01595454).

The applications were refused on 8th December 2025.



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk

Summary

We continue to object to this application because the new proposals fail to meet the requirement of paragraph 208 of the NPPF to avoid or minimise conflict between the proposal and the conservation of heritage asset.

Historic England Advice

In our previous advice letter on the refused scheme, we set out the significance of the listed building and the relevant policy context. We do not repeat that information here, nor our comments on those elements of the former scheme that have been retained in the current proposals. Accordingly, our earlier advice should be read alongside the comments below on the recently submitted applications.

Impact of Revised Proposals

The key changes to the refused scheme include the following:

- Reinstatement of the 17th-century winder staircase reconstructed in its original form using salvaged historic fabric, including lath-and-plaster soffits and the ground-floor enclosure. Access to the basement would also to be restored following the historic arrangement, and access to the attic reinstated via a new hatch. The reconstruction would however omit the first-floor enclosure.

The proposal would mitigate some of the harm caused by the staircase's demolition, but there would still be a loss of 17th-century fabric and, due to the omission of the first-floor enclosure, a reduced ability to appreciate its historic form.

- Reinstatement of the partition removed without consent, enclosing a small snug to the north-west corner of the main parlour. The reinstatement would include a horizontal oak member with lime plastered infill panels, as well as the door jamb.

This proposal would reduce some harm to significance by restoring the ability to appreciate the original bay planform; however, there would still be a loss of historic fabric.

- Omission of the upper triangular glazed section on the west elevation of the bakehouse - reconstructed after collapse/demolition - and insertion of a six-pane Crittal window, as approved in the consented scheme.



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk

This change would make a minor contribution to re-instating the bakehouse's original significance as the reconstruction provides merely a superficial replica of the building's historic form.

- Insertion of oak joists at ceiling level in the south-east bedroom, retaining the exposed new skelting formed without consent following removal of the existing attic floor structure.

This proposal would result in an awkward configuration and would therefore fail to mitigate the harm caused.

- Reinstatement of lime-plaster infill panels to the historic timber-framed spine between the first-floor north bedroom and the adjacent room to improve the legibility of their original layout as distinct spaces.

However, the partitioned en-suite - installed without consent - would be retained. The harm caused would therefore only be partially reduced.

- Reinstatement of lost floorboards in the southern part of the attic - fabric previously repurposed to make doors and the cellar hatch - using modern components in aged oak.

This intervention is welcome but cannot fully recover the significance that has been lost.

With regard to the exposed water-well, discovered during the earlier works, the submitted Planning Statement (December 2025) refers to a video recording demonstrating the accuracy of the brick shaft relining. We have not had sight of this evidence.

Historic England's Position on the Revised Proposals

We consider that the majority of the works undertaken in variation of, or without, consent have caused harm - to varying degrees - to the significance of the listed building. They have removed or obscured important historic features that illustrate the building's evolution and multi-phased character, from its original 15th-century origins to the 19th century.

Although some of the currently proposed mitigations would reduce the harm caused by the unauthorised works, they would not do so to an adequate extent to counteract the harm.

In particular, some of the works implemented without consent have compromised the ability to appreciate the late Georgian phase in the building's evolution. These

include the concealment and masking of the 1830s gable bay by the enlarged and redesigned first-floor rear extension, as well as the complete demolition of the chimney stack raising from ground to roof level on the north wall.

In addition, the formation of a skelining in the south-east bedroom - achieved through demolition of the existing ceiling structure - has altered the room's proportions, giving a misleading impression of the historic roof form, and obscuring understanding of the building's development when, in the 17th century, the attic was brought into domestic use. This work may also have resulted in the loss of historic fabric.

The insertion of a partition to form an en-suite bathroom to the north bedroom, and the creation of a ground-floor lavatory, have altered the original plan form of these spaces, with potential loss of historic fabric in the case of the latter. The introduction of modern fireplaces in the ground-floor living room and study has also changed the historic character of these rooms and concealed their chimney breasts and hearths. The infilling of the internalised openings within the 15th-century rear wall - although their precise original position remains unconfirmed - has reduced interpretive value.

Overall, taking into account the latest proposed changes, we think that the harm would fall within the less than substantial range of the NPPF and at a mid-level within that spectrum for certain elements of the scheme. In particular, the reconfigured first-floor rear extension, which has also adversely affected the character and appearance of the conservation area as appreciated from the west, is a particularly harmful element for the reasons explained above.

We consider that there remains scope to further reduce harm without preventing the legitimate objective of updating the house. As such, the revised applications still fail to avoid or minimise the conflict between the proposal and the conservation of the heritage asset, as required by paragraph 208 of the NPPF.

Your authority should carefully consider the situation of works that have been undertaken without consent and be clear over what is and is not acceptable. You should then consider taking appropriate enforcement action to address those elements that are deemed unacceptable.

In making this assessment, you will need to carefully consider the extent to which any public benefits arising from the works weigh against the harm highlighted in this letter, and whether clear and convincing justification has been provided for them.

Recommendation

Historic England objects to the applications on heritage grounds.



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk



We consider that the applications do not meet the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers 208 and 219. It is for your Authority to assess whether the proposals meet the requirements of paragraphs 213 and 215 of the NPPF.

In determining these applications, you should bear in mind the statutory duty of section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

Relevant is also section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 that requires LPAs to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Your authority should take these representations into account in determining the applications. If you propose to determine the applications in their current form, please inform us of the date of the committee and send us a copy of your report at the earliest opportunity.

Please contact me if we can be of further assistance.

Yours sincerely

Luciana Gallo

Luciana Gallo RIBA PhD FSA

Assistant Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas
London and South East Regions Group
M: 07384 826 458



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk