

From: Richard Dollamore <richard@whaleback.co.uk>
Sent: 22 May 2026 11:45:16 UTC+01:00
To: "Andrew Horrell" <andrew.horrell@midsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: "Joanne Fisher" <joanne.fisher@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/25/3072 and 3073 The Coach House, Nether Walstead
Attachments: Ty-Mawr Sublime Literature - 2022.pdf, Indicative Construction Details 1 to10.pdf

Dear Andrew

Please find below and attached further information relating to the proposed approach to the insulation of the floor, walls and roof, together with the methodology for timber frame repairs.

The details submitted are intended to establish the proposed conservation principles, material approach and construction strategy at a level proportionate to determination of the application. More detailed information will necessarily depend upon further detailed surveying following consent, which is normal practice for historic buildings where the extent and condition of fabric cannot be fully understood in advance. Detailed junctions, repair schedules and method statements can, where appropriate, be secured by condition.

Floor insulation

The proposed approach to floor insulation follows the principles set out within Historic England's advice note Insulating Solid Ground Floors in Older Buildings:




Figure 6: Insulating limecrete slab
Where a decision is taken to insulate a historic floor then one option is to provide a permeable insulated floor slab as shown here. Expanded clay is used as the insulant.

The proposal adopts a breathable floor build-up intended to improve thermal performance while allowing the movement and evaporation of moisture, thereby avoiding the risks associated with impermeable floor constructions in traditional buildings. The attached Ty-Mawr Sublime literature provides further indicative information. A detailed site-specific section and specification can be secured by condition following detailed investigation.

This level of information has recently been accepted by Merlin Lewis, SPAB Caseworker, on a comparable listed barn project and reflects an appropriate degree of detail at this stage.

Timber frame repair methodology

A conservation-led strategy is proposed, based on the principles of minimal intervention and maximum retention of historic fabric.

Prior to commencement of works, the timber frame will be subject to a comprehensive condition survey undertaken by a suitably qualified conservation engineer or specialist carpenter. This will include inspection of structural bearings, joints and concealed elements, ensuring that any interventions are evidence-based and proportionate.

Repairs will follow a clear hierarchy of intervention. Sound historic fabric will be retained wherever possible. Where defects are identified, localised repairs will be undertaken using traditional carpentry techniques, including piecing-in, splicing, scarf joints and mortice-and-tenon repairs detailed to match the existing construction. New timber will generally comprise seasoned oak to ensure compatibility in both structural and hygroscopic performance.

Later softwood repairs will be reviewed and, where inappropriate or failing, replaced with oak. Wholesale replacement of historic timber elements will be avoided unless components are demonstrably beyond repair. Modern interventions will be reversible where practicable, and impermeable or otherwise incompatible materials will be avoided.

Should it be considered necessary, a detailed schedule of repairs together with method statements and large-scale joinery details could be secured by condition following completion of the survey process.

Wall construction and insulation

The proposed works to the timber-framed envelope have been designed to improve thermal performance while maintaining a fully breathable construction appropriate to a traditional timber-framed building.

The existing weatherboarding is modern and of limited heritage significance and will be replaced with feather-edge boarding of an appropriate section and detailing. Behind this, a ventilated cavity and vapour-permeable breather membrane will be introduced. Insulation is proposed in the form of wood fibre, together with an internal wood fibre board and lime plaster finish.

This build-up provides continuity of vapour permeability, allowing moisture movement through the construction and reducing the risk of trapped moisture and interstitial condensation. The proposed approach accords with established conservation principles.

The attached section is indicative at this stage and is intended to demonstrate the proposed principles and material approach. Final specifications and junction details can be secured by condition following completion of the detailed inspection and survey process.

Please let me know if any further clarification would be helpful.

Best wishes

Richard

From: Andrew Horrell <andrew.horrell@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 4:39 PM
To: Richard Dollamore <richard@whaleback.co.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/25/3072 and 3073 The Coach House, Nether Walstead

Mr Dollamore,

Many thanks for your email outlining your response to the comments from the Conservation Officer.

Your confirmation as to the future submission of a gate application is noted.

Your reasonings are also noted and I look forward to receiving the insulation details. Once this is received, I will be in position to determine the application. I will seek the advice and opinion of my senior colleague Joanne Fisher prior to making a recommendation.

Kind regards,

Andrew Horrell BA (Hons) MSc Town Planning
Planning Officer
Development Management

andrew.horrell@midsussex.gov.uk (mail to andrew.horrell@midsussex.gov.uk) <http://www.midsussex.gov.uk>

01444 477446

Working together for a better Mid Sussex



From: Richard Dollamore <richard@whaleback.co.uk>

Sent: 06 May 2026 13:26

To: Andrew Horrell <andrew.horrell@midsussex.gov.uk>; Emily Wade <emily.wade@midsussex.gov.uk>

Cc: Joanne Fisher <joanne.fisher@midsussex.gov.uk>; Nick Corrie <nick@georgeandjames.co.uk>; Darren Leach <darren@georgeandjames.co.uk>

Subject: FW: DM/25/3072 and 3073 The Coach House, Nether Walstead

Dear Andrew,

Thank you for forwarding Emily's further comments.

We have reviewed these carefully and while we acknowledge the constructive points raised, we remain concerned that the position on the link element continues to be informed by a preference for a particular design approach, rather than an assessment grounded in the specific heritage significance of the site. We have interspersed further responses in blue ([RD2](#)).

In summary:

- Link design and form: The proposal responds to clear map and fabric evidence that this part of the site historically read as a more continuous group. The current separation is a relatively recent condition and does not in itself carry heritage significance. The scheme therefore seeks, in a measured way, to re-establish a more coherent understanding of the building group. We do not accept that the link is overscaled or that it obscures the Shed; rather, it improves legibility and results in a more resolved composition. The preference for a lightweight glazed link appears to be a stylistic position, which in this instance would result in a less appropriate and less integrated outcome.
- Heritage impact: The Coach House is substantially altered and does not derive significance from the current gap. There is no clear heritage justification for maintaining this separation, and the proposal does not give rise to harm in this respect.
- Shed amendments: We note that the revised treatment of the southern elevation is now supported.

- Technical details: Notwithstanding our earlier position, we will provide detailed information on insulation and construction at this stage to assist determination and demonstrate that the approach follows established conservation principles.
- Gate: A separate application is being prepared to address this and will be submitted shortly.

Overall, the principle of the development is accepted, and a number of key concerns have been resolved. The remaining point of disagreement relates to the design approach to the link, where we consider the current proposal to be both justified and appropriate in heritage terms.

We would welcome your view on how best to progress matters from here, particularly in terms of moving the application towards determination.

Kind regards,

Richard

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 01 May 2026 10:03
To: Andrew Horrell <Andrew.Horrell@midsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: Joanne Fisher <Joanne.Fisher@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/25/3072 and 3073 The Coach House, Nether Walstead

Hi Andrew

Please see below further comments on the above application. For ease, I have added these in red to my original comments and the applicant's response, below.

In summary, although some positive steps have been taken the proposal remains contentious in terms of the form and design of the link. The required insulation have also not been provided.

Thanks,

Emily

Please note that this advice is given at Officer level only and is without prejudice to the formal decision of the District Council.

Submit your planning application online.
<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk>

Emily Wade Ma MSc

Conservation Officer
Planning Services
Tel: +44 (0)1444 477385
emily.wade@midsussex.gov.uk <http://www.midsussex.gov.uk>

From: Richard Dollamore <richard@whaleback.co.uk>
Sent: 25 March 2026 16:28
To: Andrew Horrell <andrew.horrell@midsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: Emily Wade <emily.wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/25/3072 and 3073 The Coach House, Nether Walstead

Hi Andrew,

Thank you for Emily's comments on the above applications.

We have reviewed these carefully and have interspersed responses within Emily's email below, in [blue](#) for ease of reference.

In summary:

- The window design to the Coach House has been revised to reflect the historic glazing bar pattern found elsewhere within the courtyard group.
- The link element has been amended to reflect the historic relationship between the buildings.
- The treatment of the southern elevation of the Shed has been amended to better express its historic character.
- The sliding gate is to be removed from this application.

We trust that these amendments and additional justification enable this application to proceed to approval.

Kind Regards

Richard

Hi Andrew

Comments on the above planning and listed building consent applications. My apologies for the delay in getting these to you, which has been caused by pressure of other work.

Nether Walstead is a Grade II listed building, a former farmhouse which was significantly extended in the early 20th century to form a country house of some pretension. The former farm buildings of the farmstead appear to have been located to the northeast of the house, ranged around a series of yards. A small number of historic buildings survive in this area. The Coach House is a two-storey brick and clad building which appears on historical maps dating from the 19th century and would be regarded as curtilage listed, although it is noted that the structure

was apparently substantially rebuilt during the later 20th century. A single storey timber framed and weatherboarded structure known as The Shed sits to the northwest of this.

The current proposal, which is partly retrospective, is for works to the Coach House and Shed comprising construction of a link extension, internal and external alterations, and retention of a sliding metal gate which has been installed the southeast of the buildings. These applications follow on from pre-application advice.

With respect to the Coach House itself, externally it is proposed to remove the existing uPVC cladding to the upper floor, make adjustments to window openings, infill the existing garage door opening, install replacement windows, and carry out other minor works. Internally, existing partitions would be removed to allow for a reconfigured plan form.

In principle, given the level of existing alterations to the building, these works are not considered contentious. The removal of uPVC cladding, uPVC windows and the garage door has the potential to enhance the appearance of the building and its contribution to the setting of Nether Walstead. However, I would recommend that the window design is amended to better reflect the traditional nature of the original building and its evolved domestic appearance- multi-pane casements will in this context be preferable to the large pane casements shown. Conditions would be required on any eventual permission relating to details of materials and the detailed design of windows and external doors.

RD: The glazing bar pattern has been updated to respond to the historic window within the existing garage/ studio barn building, see attached.

The glazing pattern has been amended to show a vertical bar only added. This matches the design of a historical window elsewhere in the courtyard group, as illustrated by the submitted photograph and is considered acceptable, subject to detail.

A linking structure is proposed between the Coach House and the Shed. The principle of this was discussed at pre-application stage and considered acceptable. However, the design as submitted raises a number of concerns:

1. The footprint and bulk of the structure is excessive due to the inclusion of a covered porch under a metal standing seam roof to the northern side. This element of the proposal is unnecessary and should be omitted. If the porch is considered necessary as a result of the relocation of the principle entrance to the link structure, this may also require reconsideration.

RD: The design has been amended so that the roof form now continues the existing pitched roof. This approach also reflects historic evidence that the Shed formerly abutted the earlier stable building. The covered area is modest in scale and reads as a subservient functional space (e.g. log store), rather than a formal entrance.

The porch has not been removed, but the design of the roof to the link has been amended to be a continuation of the pitched roof to the Shed. Although I note the point that the footprint of this part of the building group has changed over time and that at one point the two buildings on the site were abutting, this has not been the case for a century or more. In the existing context, I would not consider it appropriate to extend the Shed in a manner which is such that the form and footprint of the historic building are obscured, as would be the case if the roof were to be extended as shown. I remain of the opinion that as shown the link is overscaled and inappropriate in form, and that the substantial porch element should be omitted and the design of the link itself amended in favour of a simple glazed link as discussed at pre-application.

RD2: Map and built fabric evidence indicate that the Shed was formerly more extensive and that buildings on this part of the site historically read as a more continuous group, rather than as clearly separated elements. The current gap is therefore a relatively recent condition and does not in itself carry heritage significance.

The proposal responds directly to this context. The extension to the Shed is not an arbitrary enlargement, but a considered response to its established form, scale and materiality, which assists in re-establishing a more coherent understanding of the building's historic proportions. It does not obscure significance; rather, it improves legibility.

The link is appropriate in scale and will read as later work. The suggestion that it is "overscaled" is not supported by the proportions of the proposal or by the historic evidence. Conversely, the omission of the covered element would result in a weaker and less resolved composition.

The preference for a lightweight glazed link appears to derive from a particular design approach rather than from an assessment of heritage significance. In this instance, such an approach would introduce a self-conscious intervention that does not reflect the character or evolution of the building group.

2. The link itself is not the lightweight largely glazed structure which was anticipated following pre-application advice. This applies to both elevations, but particularly to the southern side, and to the roof. This reduces the sense of separation between the Coach House and Shed. The design and materials of the structure require reconsideration.

RD: Historic mapping and fabric evidence indicate that the buildings were historically attached. The revised scheme therefore reflects a reinstated relationship rather than introducing a new one.

As above, the relationship described has not been present for a century or more, during which time both buildings and in particular the Coach House have evolved. The proposal will not therefore meaningfully reinstate the historical form of development, but it does reduce the legibility of the Shed, and also as previously noted reduces the sense of separation between the Shed and the Coach House. I would again suggest that the form, design and materials of the structure should be reconsidered to provide a modest, lightweight link which allows the existing historic buildings on the site to be clearly appreciated.

RD2: The position set out reflects an unduly narrow interpretation of conservation practice. The objective should be to sustain and enhance significance, not to preserve a reduced or incidental condition that has resulted from partial loss.

There is clear and well-established precedent, supported by national guidance, for proposals which reinstate aspects of a building's former scale or relationship where this aids

understanding of its historic form. The current scheme follows that approach in a measured and proportionate way.

The assertion that the proposal diminishes the legibility of the Shed is not accepted. The form, junctions and material treatment ensure that the extent of the historic structure remains clearly discernible. If anything, the proposal provides a more coherent reading of the building than the existing truncated condition.

There is also no clear heritage justification for requiring the continued visual separation of the buildings. The Coach House itself is substantially rebuilt and does not derive significance from this separation. As such, maintaining the gap does not meaningfully contribute to the appreciation of the site's history.

The recommendation for a lightweight glazed link is therefore not supported by the specific context of this site, nor by policy. It represents a stylistic preference rather than a heritage-led requirement, and its imposition would result in a less appropriate and less well-integrated solution.

The Shed is a 19th century timber framed and weatherboarded structure with a clay tiled roof. A brief historical map regression exercise suggests that it was originally open on its southern side, suggesting use as a cattle or cart shed- however as it faced onto a yard, the latter is more likely. More recently, the southern elevation has been infilled with brickwork and an opening formed in the weatherboarding to its northern elevation to allow use for storage.

The current proposal to convert the building for residential use as an annexe to the Coach House is not considered contentious in principle. However, in my opinion aspects of the associated works would benefit from amendment, or further information:

3. As noted at pre-application stage, it will be better for fenestration etc. to reflect existing or historic openings to the building. Although the fenestration to the northern side does sit within the existing opening, to the south new windows of a domestic appearance are shown sitting within the existing brickwork infill to the originally open elevation, which has been previously inserted between the retained original timber posts. It will be better if one or more openings are formed to this elevation which fully open up one or more bays of the structure, with an appropriately framed glazed infill- this approach could reinstate something of the building's original appearance, whereas the fenestration currently shown is domestic in its character and detracts from the surviving agricultural nature of The Shed. This aspect of the proposal requires reconsideration, and if necessary, the internal layout rethought accordingly.

RD: The non-historic brick infill has been removed and replaced with glazed infill set between retained timber posts, reinstating the open cart-shed character and avoiding domestic-style fenestration.

This amendment is welcomed and overcomes previous concerns with respect to the treatment of the south elevation of the Shed.

4. Further information should be provided regarding the proposed method of insulation to floor, walls and roof of the building. I would prefer to see this now rather than by condition, as it will be fundamental to the practical implementation of the scheme. We will need to see detailed typical elevations and sections which demonstrate how historic fabric which is of interest, such as the timber framing to the roof and some of the walls of the building, is retained and exposed to view.

RD: Historic England guidance will be followed, see:

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/eehb-insulating-pitched-roofs-rafter-level-warm-roofs/heag070-insulating-pitched-roof-rafter-warm-roofs/>

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/eehb-insulating-timber-framed-walls/heag071-insulating-timber-framed-walls/>

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/eehb-insulating-solid-ground-floors/heag087-solid-floors/>

Detailed sections can be secured by condition if required.

Although it is good to note that Historic England guidance will be followed, I am afraid that we do require details to be provided at this stage rather than by condition, for the reasons set out in my initial comments. It is much better that any potential issues with this are identified and addressed now rather than problems arising after a consent is potentially granted and works commenced. This is our standard practice in dealing with conversions of traditional farm buildings of heritage value.

RD2: Notwithstanding the above, we are content to provide the requested technical details at this stage in order to assist the determination of the application.

Detailed information will therefore be prepared setting out the proposed insulation strategy and typical junctions for the floor, walls and roof. This will demonstrate how the historic fabric is to be retained, repaired and, where appropriate, left exposed, in accordance with established conservation principles.

The approach will follow relevant guidance, including that published by Historic England, and will reflect a conservative repair philosophy with minimal intervention to significant fabric.

We note that in comparable cases, including those reviewed by the SPAB, it is accepted that final specifications and junction details are often refined through condition. However, in this instance, the requested information will be provided to give clarity on the practical implementation of the scheme and to confirm that no harm would arise to the significance of the building.

Further detail will also be required of the repair work noted to the timber framed structure of the building. It is understood that the extent and nature of these repairs may not become apparent until the cladding and roof tiles are removed; however the applicant should be aware that work would need to cease at this point to allow for the submission and consideration of a detailed condition report and schedule of works, which could be required by condition on any eventual approval.

A conservative repair approach is proposed in line with best conservation practice:

- Careful strip-out of cladding/roof coverings.
- Full condition survey of exposed timber frame.
- Maximum retention of historic fabric.
- Repair rather than replacement wherever feasible.
- Splice repairs using matching timber species and traditional carpentry joints.
- Resin repairs only where structurally appropriate and minimal.
- Like-for-like replacement of severely decayed elements.
- New work to be identifiable on close inspection but visually consistent.
- Avoid chemical treatments unless essential; address moisture source instead.
- If significant unforeseen repairs are required, works will pause to allow agreement of a schedule of repairs with the LPA (secured by condition if necessary).

This approach is welcomed in principle, but detail will be required by condition.

RD2: as above

The new metal gate, which is already in place, is located sitting across the driveway to the southeast of the coach house. It is a solid metal vehicular gate which opens on a sliding mechanism. Planning permission was granted in 2025 for a timber panelled side hung pedestrian gate with an adjacent short section of timber panelled fencing in this location, as well as further gates and gate posts along the main entrance driveway. None of these gates and gate posts have been installed according to the planning permission- the remaining unauthorised works are currently subject of a separate pre-application enquiry.

Whilst in the context of the existing approval there is no objection in principle to a new gate in this location, the design and materials of the gate as installed **are not sympathetic to the context**. Due to its materials and finish and its opening mechanism the gate has a starkly contemporary, urban appearance which is not appropriate for the rural setting of the listed house and curtilage listed former agricultural buildings. It should be removed, and this application amended to show a gate of a more appropriate design and materials, such as a side hung five bar timber gate, which would allow vehicular access if required, or a pedestrian gate similar to that already approved.

RD: The sliding gate is to be removed from this application.

This is noted. However, as the gate has already been installed, can the applicant please confirm what the intention is in this respect, i.e. to remove the gate, or to make a separate application to retain it, for example?

RD2: A separate application is in preparation and will be submitted shortly to address this matter.

In summary, although the principle of the proposals is not considered contentious, as been established through pre-application advice or in the case of the gate by an existing planning permission, the detail of the scheme as submitted requires some reconsideration and amendment in order to ensure that the special interests of curtilage listed structures and, through impact on setting, of Nether Walstead house are preserved.

I will provide separate comments shortly on both the parallel planning and listed building applications concerning the house itself and the pre-application enquiry relating to the other gates as installed.

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.