

From: Rainier, Peter <Peter.Rainier@dmhstallard.com>
Sent: 02 December 2025 20:02:51 UTC+00:00
To: "Susan Dubberley" <Susan.Dubberley@midsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: "Steve Ashdown" <Steve.Ashdown@midsussex.gov.uk>; "Simon Dougall" <simon.dougall@btinternet.com>; "Ann Biggs" <ann.biggs@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: DM/25/1104 & DM/25/1103 – Marlow House, 107 High Street, Lindfield - Comments on Committee Report [DMHS-DMS.FID8001034]
Attachments: Cellar Work - Marlow House, 107 High Street, RH16 2HR.pdf, Marlow House - Historic England report - DM/25/1103 [DMHS-DMS.FID8001034]

Dear Susan,

I refer to the reports which are contained within the Planning Committee Agenda for Thursday 4th December, relating to Marlow House.

We have carefully considered the contents of the reports and would wish to place on record the following comments. I trust that the contents of this email will be made available to Members via the Agenda Update Sheet, before the matter is debated.

The statements regarding the rear extension are, in my view, misleading and exaggerated throughout both applications. There is an implication the whole rear extension is at issue, when the previous permission consented a large part of the addition and balcony to the southern end. The additional floor area proposed here is just 170cm x 320cm. The balcony, was approved to go the full width in the original approval.

2.5 It must be noted that the so-called 'overbearing rear extension', it is normally a term used when the impact on neighbouring residential amenity is harmfully impacted. There is no discussion in the report which supports this comment. The immediate neighbours support the scheme and consider that there is no unacceptable overlooking or that the development is overbearing. They also confirm it is not obtrusive. It is noteworthy that the rear addition is not visible in public views, but rather only partially visible from neighbouring rear gardens. The language used in report is unnecessarily emotive the modern rear addition does not 'engulf' the historic dwelling because for it do so it would need to 'cover it completely', that is clearly not the case.

2.6 and 2.7 We disagree with the assertion that there are no public benefits (see further below)). All neighbours are benefiting especially 105 as per his recent letter. The property would have fallen into further disrepair if the works had not been undertaken.

4.1 The summary of comments made in support of the application are very selective. Please note the immediate neighbours fully support the proposal.

5. There is no acknowledgement of my email of 6th November, this is very surprising as it makes significant concessions given the points raised by Historic England. Perhaps most importantly, there should have been acknowledgement of the intention to reinstate the staircases as original.

10.3 to 10.6 In summary (as set out in the 6th November email – copy enclosed) the applicants have agreed to reinstate the staircases and basement access plus the additional benefit of the loft hatch.

10.8 This is incorrect as only shelving existed with a modern rear plasterboard wall.

10.9 The evidence that we have produced has proved a door existed here. Lime plaster of the infills has been offered in lieu of the modern plaster. A benefit. There has been no door removal.

10.21 The latest submitted cellar report (copy enclosed) answers all the accusations. The cellar report which confirms floor is original and the lime render is the most effective and traditional way of dealing with the damp, but if necessary the email of 6th November confirms a willingness to remove the render.

10.22 Joists here have been fully justified.

10.26 Soot Blackening clearly revealed in the southern bedroom.

10.27 Not in height.

10.28 The Bakehouse collapsed but was rebuilt to the exact same dimensions. The only differences are the triangle of glass and chimney. Although similar to the Doodie Stark building in the High Street the 6th November email expresses a willingness to remove the glazed triangle. The chimney was only built slightly higher due to the need to comply with Building Regulations.

10.29 Structural report from expert justifies dismantling.

12.8/12.9 As set out in the 6th November email the applicant is willing to reinstate the staircases and access to basement and loft. As set out previously, this is a significant improvement to the scheme which has been described in the Committee Report. The introduction of the loft hatch is also a clear heritage benefits.

12.10 The 6th November email expresses a willingness to reinstate joists in the ceiling. Existing ceiling finishes were shown to be removed - see approved planning drawings. By removing ceiling finishes it is also exposing soot blackening more prominently.

12.12 Although the Heritage Officer seems reluctant to accept it the exposing of the well is a clear heritage benefit.

12.14 Planning approved drawing confirms ceiling finish to be removed. It is proposed that joists are replace in oak. Photographs have been submitted of the artex and plasterboard ceiling.

12.15 The additional section of rear extension is only 170 x 320cm. The Victorian gable wall will be retained and visible internally and externally through the windows. The 'Gothic window' was modern as confirmed in the submitted heritage but is still fully intact and will be displayed. The Bakehouse still survives to the exact dimensions. Two walls are original and the only historic fabric were the bricks. The Bakehouse was not demolished it partially collapsed. Again, only the triangle of glazing at high level differs from the original, and if deemed necessary, this will be removed.

12.16 The submitted Mc Carey Simmons structural engineers report confirms that the chimney was unsafe.

12.19 Neighbours wrote to the Council stating the building was in a very poor state of repair and at risk. Public benefits have been referred to above.

The scheme will deliver an exemplary restoration and refurbishment of the 15th century timber framed house which comprises the core significance of the grade II listed building. The new interventions are sensitively designed, combining traditional and contemporary elements sympathetic to the building's high architectural value and historic interest.

Taken as a whole the effects of the Proposed Scheme would be positive in heritage terms, accepting a degree of harm resulting from the full width rear extension, and master bathroom dormer roof extension. Nonetheless, the heritage benefits of the proposal are manifold, in conjunction with the overarching benefit of securing the heritage asset's beneficial use as a single dwelling on a long-term basis as part of a fully restored property which was previously in very poor condition. Indeed, the implemented scheme included the restoration of the building's external envelope and adjoining gable wall to No. 109 which has been repointed in hydraulic lime mortar. Overall, the heritage benefits of the proposal outweigh the harm, resulting in no residual heritage harm on the basis of internal heritage balance. Furthermore, the scheme as implemented has been executed to a very high standard with outstanding attention to detail (e.g. joinery, carpentry, ironmongery, masonry and timber framing repairs) to the extent that it is many ways an exemplary scheme. Indeed, the project has won a number of awards, including recognition from the Sussex Heritage Trust 2025 (winner of Small Scale Restoration Award, Restoration, Conversion and Extension and winner of Master Craftsman for the quality of workmanship in Marlow House) and Crittall - House of the Year (2025).

The NPPF requires that where less than substantial harm is identified, "this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use." The public benefits in this case appear to be:

1. Rescue of a Grade II listed building from neglect and decay
2. Securing its future use and long-term conservation
3. Removal of a building from potential heritage at risk status
4. Enhancement to the Conservation Area
5. Exemplar award winning conservation project with educational value

These are real and substantial public benefits that outweigh the identified harm, particularly given all the revisions and re-instatement works offered.

Kind regards,

Peter

Peter Rainier | Principal Director of Planning | Tel: [01293 605160](tel:01293605160) |

For and on behalf of DMH Stallard LLP

Origin One, 108 High Street, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 1BD

All of our Gatwick teams are now based together in one office at Origin One, 108 High Street, Crawley. West Sussex. RH10 1BD.



IMPORTANT MESSAGE:

Please be aware of cyber crime. DMH Stallard LLP will NOT notify changes to our bank account details by email.

If you receive any communications suggesting that the firm's bank account details have changed, you should contact the firm via the number on the firm's website or headed notepaper immediately to confirm the details before making payment.

Please be aware that a phishing email may contain a fraudulent phone number for DMH Stallard LLP. DMH Stallard LLP will not take responsibility if you transfer money to a wrong account.

DMH Stallard LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales (registered number OC338287).

Its registered office is at The Portland Building, 27-28 Church Street, Brighton, East Sussex. BN1 1RB and it is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (ID. 490576).

The term "partner" is used to refer to a member of DMH Stallard LLP or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications. A list of our members, and of the non-members who are designated as partners, is open to inspection at our Brighton office.

[Please click here to see our disclaimer](#)

Please don't print this email unless you really need to.

