

Comment by Emiliy Wade

Applicate response in red.

Hi Anna

Comments on the above planning and listed building consent applications.

Toll House is a Grade II listed building located in a prominent position on Lindfield High Street. The building originally dates from the 15th – 16th century, possibly constructed as a cross wing to a larger medieval house sited to the south, which was later replaced. It was extended to its west, street facing elevation c.1630, at which time a substantial chimney stack was also added to the rear of the building. A lean-to addition was made to the rear of the building during the 18th century. The building was used as a toll house between 1803 and 1884, in association with toll gates placed across the adjacent road. The property has a rear yard which is partly occupied by a range of outbuildings along its southern edge, which are suggested to date from the first half of the 20th century, replacing earlier structures in this position.

The current applications follow on from refusal of planning and listed building consent for works including the reconfiguration of the rear ground floor layout, other internal alterations including installation of insulation and restoration of the main fireplace, and external works including removal of part of the existing rear addition and construction of a single storey rear extension, a new porch to the side of the building, rebuilding of a party boundary wall, and a new front boundary fence and gate. Subsequent appeals were dismissed.

The current proposal attempts to address the contentious aspects of the previous applications. The works now proposed include:

Externally:

1. Removal and replacement of the outbuildings to the rear with a single storey extension with a glazed link to the house;
2. Reinstatement of a fence and gates to the front of the property;
3. Reinstatement of the cellar window to the side elevation;
4. Replacement of the existing window to the front gable at attic level;
5. Removal of lettering from the front elevation;
6. Replacement of guttering;
7. Timber frame repairs;
8. New rooflight to the side roof slope;
9. Repair and rebuilding of the northern side boundary party wall;
10. Relaying of a the brick path to the side of the house.

Internally:

11. Installation of internal insulation to some external walls;

12. Reconfiguration of the layout at ground and first floors;
13. Reconfiguration of staircase and creation of a shower room at second floor; and
14. Replacement of modern floor finishes.
15. Reinstatement of a fireplace to the ground floor front room.

To consider these works in turn:

Externally:

16. The existing outbuildings are suggested to date from the first half of the 20th century. In dismissing the previous appeals on the site, the Inspector concluded that their removal would result in only minor harm to the special interest of the listed building. In this context, the principle of their demolition and replacement is considered potentially acceptable, subject to the quality of the design of the replacement structure. **Thank you** As shown, the extension would take the form of a brick built annexe under a monopitch roof forming a lean-to resting against the retained high brick southern boundary wall. This annexe would have large metal framed doors and windows to both western and northern elevations, large rooflights to the slate roof, and would be attached to the house by a fully glazed link. The existing lean-to to the rear of the house itself, which is partly 18th or 19th century in date, would be partly retained, with the fabric to be removed identified as dating from the 20th century. Large rooflights would be included within the roof of this addition.

On the basis of the Inspector's comments, the principle of the demolition and rebuilding of the existing outbuildings is considered difficult to resist. It is noted that the existing lean-to, which is of more interest, is to be partially retained. This is also considered acceptable, **thank you** although see below w.r.t. the rooflights to the lean-to roof.

The proposed replacement rear annexe/outbuilding retains a similar monopitch lean-to roof set against the party boundary wall to the existing structure, but is slightly wider in footprint. It is however set off the rear of the house by a fully glazed link. On balance, this is considered acceptable, **thank you** as the extension has a similar relationship to the house and in particular the 17th century chimney stack as the existing situation. As noted with previous applications, the submitted elevations are quite basically represented and are lacking in detail. An appropriate condition is therefore recommended below.

I would also note that the rooflights to the roof slope of the existing, retained lean-to appear overscaled - notwithstanding that this fabric is suggested to date from the 20th century I would suggest that they should be reduced in size in terms of both their width and their depth so that they are more subordinate to the existing solid roof of the structure. **Agreed, the rooflights will be reduced in scale in width and depth.**

These drawings are part of the conditions, as such, we assume updated drawings for these rooflights, with reduced height and width are not required prior to determination.

17. The proposed new fence to the front of the building is sympathetic to the context and is not considered contentious. **Thank you.**

18. The reinstatement of the cellar window in an existing opening is not considered contentious subject to detail. **Thank you.**
19. The proposed replacement window at attic level is not considered contentious subject to detail. **Thank you.**
20. The removal of the lettering to the front elevation is not considered contentious and should enhance the appearance of this part of the building. **Thank you.**
21. The proposed replacement rain water pipework includes faux 'cast iron' uPVC guttering, which would not normally be considered acceptable in the context of a listed building within a Conservation Area, however in this instance plastic guttering is already in place. On balance, this aspect of the proposal is therefore considered acceptable. **Thank you.**
22. Repairs are proposed to the timber framing to the side elevation of the building. While this is not considered contentious in principle, further information on the nature and extent of the repairs would be required, which could be requested by condition. **Thank you.**
23. The new rooflight to the side roofslope appears somewhat incongruous in this currently unbroken roof slope. We also have no information in front of us regarding the impact on the historic fabric of the roof. **As per the proposal and acceptance above the outbuilding and its roof would be removed and replaced (the asbestos roof would be disposed of).** I would recommend that this aspect of the proposal is omitted. **Our Heritage team have again reviewed this weekend and do not believe this element of the proposal with the current design is harmful to the property.**


In the interests of resolving, it is proposed: If the rooflights are reduced in scale would this be considered acceptable, as per the other rooflights? If this is still not considered acceptable, if the proposal reduces the rooflights in this area from 3 to 2 and a reduction in the scale, would this be considered acceptable?

These drawings are part of the conditions, as such, we assume updated drawings for these rooflights are not required prior to determination, following agreement.


Thank you for your consideration.

24. The proposed rebuilding of the brick wall is justified by a structural report which confirms the poor condition of the existing wall. The proposal is to rebuild the wall on a more or less like-for-like basis, saving the inclusion of weep holes and a differing corner detail, which are not considered contentious, although I do have a query stemming from the structural report. This states that to be structurally sound the wall can be reconstructed in the same manner as existing (i.e. a single brick in thickness) to a height of 1.35m, which is the height of the majority of the existing wall. However the front portion of the wall, adjacent to the High Street, is 2.05m high, and the plans suggest that the proposal is to also reconstruct this section to its existing height. Can the applicant please confirm that this is also a structurally sound detail?

The proposal is to reconstruct the party wall and the very corner of the wall and the neighbouring wall, as per Listing Wall Rebuild Location plan 56HS-011-P-40:



and Listing Wall Rebuild Elevations 56HS-011-P-41:



All heights will remain the same. All stones of interest will also remain in the same locations.

The proposal is not to rebuild the neighbouring wall that fronts the High Street, simply to tie the corner in correctly at the party wall location.



Any works on the neighbouring wall that fronts the High Street would be subject to a separate planning application, by others.

25. The proposal to lift and reinstate the brick pathway to the side of the house is not considered contentious. Thank you

Internally:

26. Although the internal insulation was not considered contentious in principle, the level of detail provided with the previous applications was insufficient and was a reason for refusal. The current applications contain further information with respect to the location and detailing of the insulation, which confirms that existing exposed timbers will remain

exposed, as well as providing typical sectional details. The proposed drawings also confirm that relevant Historic England guidance will be conformed to in terms of the methodology of the work. This aspect of the proposal is now therefore considered acceptable. **Thank you**

27. The proposed alterations to the layout at ground and first floor are minor and do not adversely affect fabric or floorplan of interest. This work is therefore not considered contentious. **Thank you**
28. The proposed staircase reconfiguration and new shower room at second floor affect only modern fabric and plan form and are not considered contentious, subject to detail. **Thank you**
29. The replacement of modern floor finishes is unlikely to be regarded as contentious subject to detail. **Thank you**
30. A detailed method statement has been provided relating to the proposed reinstatement of a blocked up hearth to the front room at ground floor. This is not considered contentious subject to detail of the stone to be used for the new hearth. **The proposal for the hearth material is single piece of dark slate, and in agreement with local building control regulations.**

In summary the majority of the scheme before us is considered acceptable, and successfully addresses the issues raised by the previous appeal scheme. However elements of the proposal require amendment/further information.

On a technical note, just to double check please that in any eventual determination all of the application documents including the DAS and the HE guidance note will be included among the plans listed on any decision notice, as these are material to the content of the application.

I would recommend the following conditions which the applicant may wish to consider and comment on at this juncture. These conditions could be (as appropriate) prior to the commencement of work on the relevant part of the proposal, as opposed to general commencement):

31. Details of roofing and facing materials.
32. Details of the brick to the rebuilt boundary wall.
33. Brickwork to the boundary wall to match existing in colour, texture and bonding pattern and in colour, texture and style of pointing.
34. Fully detailed elevational and sectional drawings at an appropriate scale of the extension and link to show detail of window and door openings including window and door heads, fenestration, external doors etc.
35. Detailed drawings, at an appropriate large scale, including elevations and sections and annotated to show materials and finishes, of the following aspects of the scheme:
36. - new windows to the house and extension including the new attic windows (the partial construction sections included on some of the drawings are not sufficient)
37. - typical eaves details to the link and extension
38. - new external and internal doors

39. - (LBC ONLY) the new banister to the staircase at second floor
40. Details of the stone to the reinstated hearth in the front room at ground floor (LBC ONLY)
41. Further details of the proposed timber frame repairs to include annotated plans to show the location and extent of the repairs, and a detailed schedule of work, including materials and methods to be employed.

Thanks,

Emily