

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 23 December 2025 16:43:32 UTC+00:00
To: "Susan Dubberley" <susan.dubberley@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/3132

Wishing you a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year. Although our offices and phone lines are closed for the Christmas period from 4pm on 24th December 2025 and reopening on Monday 5th January 2026, most of our services can be accessed online through our [website](#).

All emails will be responded to on our return on 5th January.

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 23/12/2025 4:43 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Marlow House 107 High Street Lindfield Haywards Heath West Sussex RH16 2HR
Proposal:	Retrospective planning permission for a variation to the scheme approved under DM/22/3694, incorporating some reinstatement works.
Case Officer:	Susan Dubberley

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	151 High Street Lindfield
----------	---------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	

Comments:

We write to express our support for this planning application on the following bases:

a) the works which have been completed represent a prima facie case of substantial improvement to what existed before such works took place, in addition to representing a substantial private investment to save a heritage asset from dilapidation.

b) that elements of this work were unauthorised is not at question, and the applicant has apologised publicly to the council and its officers for the genuine mistakes which have led to the retrospective application

c) the gap between the authorised and the completed work is not substantial, and the heritage consultant clearly sets out how the current scheme, with the cumulative concessions which the applicant has offered throughout the process, delivers material heritage and public benefits.

d) it is not remotely clear what a continued refusal of the proposals would either be seeking to achieve, or what it would actually achieve. The achievement of 100% compliance with the original approval would be solely for the sake of compliance, and it has been amply demonstrated that such compliance is not necessary to deliver public and heritage benefits, as this can be equally achieved through the current scheme. Is it possible that there is a desire in some quarters to make an example of those who fail, however honestly, to "follow the letter of the law" and so to discourage others? We should all hope not, for certainly, the pain and convoluted hoops through which the applicants have been put to reach this stage is discouragement enough to any of the many other listed building owners in Lindfield from making similar mistakes, however honest.

e) To use the vernacular, we are where we are, and it would simply be impossible to understand any decision at this stage of the process to refuse the current application, which restores so much of what was being lost, and to destroy the investment which the applicants have made in restoring this heritage asset which is, as evidenced by the comments received, so loved in its current form by Lindfield residents. Please don't allow the pedantic to be the enemy of the good. It would be THAT rather than approval of the proposal, which would be the real harm and which, rather than discouraging malicious wrong doing (of which there patently has been none), would simply serve as discouragement of the many others in Lindfield from investing money and love in the heritage assets in which they are fortunate enough to live.

As such, a further decision to refuse would be a refusal because the result is not identical with the original specification, NOT because the result is inconsistent with national and district policies, NOT because it has been poorly executed, and not because the result does not in its entirety represent a public good. That would be a mistake far graver than that originally made by the applicant and I am confident that the council and its officers will now bring this matter to its correct conclusion by approving the application

Kind regards