

From: Rob Harrington <rh@gouldbaxter.co.uk>
Sent: 16 September 2026 11:20:32 UTC+01:00
To: "Andrew Horrell" <Andrew.Horrell@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/26/1355 and 1356 Crosskeys, 76 High Street, LF (GH712)

Dear Andrew,

I hope all is well?

Further to your recent email with Emily's comments on the submitted proposals, please find below our formal response. I have provided these responses in the order Emily raised them:

Internal Works

1. We note this item is acceptable, with details to be reserved by condition;
2. From the comment provided, we take this to imply that the principle of the post removal is accepted, subject to a Structural Engineer confirming so. We will therefore appoint a Structural Engineer to provide the necessary calculations and details to confirm the acceptability of removing the post;
3. We note this item is acceptable, with details to be reserved by condition;
4. We note this item is acceptable, with details to be reserved by condition;
5. We note this item is acceptable, with details to be reserved by condition;
6. We note this item is acceptable;
7. The proposals here will involve raising the height of the ceiling, providing thermal insulation between and beneath the rafters so they remain concealed. An area of flat ceiling will be provided to allow for the tying of the existing rafters, with all roof timbers in this area remaining concealed by plasterboard. We would therefore ask that this item be reserved by condition, owing to the more modern nature of the addition and its therefore lesser impact on the listed building as a whole;
8. We note this item is acceptable;
9. We infer from the comment this item is acceptable in principle, and would ask that the details of this element be reserved by condition;
10. We note this item is acceptable;
11. We infer from the comment this item is acceptable in principle, with details to be reserved by condition. The structure was always intended to remain visible, which this proposal achieves;
12. We will be seeking the input of a Structural Engineer to confirm whether the works to remove this beam are feasible, and this assessment will be undertaken at the same time as the assessment for the post removal in the Kitchen;
13. The comments in 10.3.8 of the Heritage Statement do not refer to harm, but only that if the finishes are original then the timbers beneath were not intended to be seen (if this is deemed harm?). At 10.3.9, the removal of the finishes will either expose timbers of a quality that were originally intended for exposure (and therefore determine that the finishes are modern), or reveal timbers never intended to be revealed, and therefore determine that the finishes are from the 19th Century. The proposed re-roofing of the dwelling will involve the installation of thermal insulation, as described in the Planning Statement, and can therefore either be of a depth to conceal the existing rafters, or a shallower depth to reveal them. Later in Emily's response she confirms the re-roofing of the building is acceptable. This re-roofing, in common with the application we previously achieved approval for at 58 High Street (DM/21/4328), will include breathable thermal insulation between the rafters. The depth of this insulation is dependent upon the quality of the timber rafters;

14. The proposed method for lightening the beams is by using dry ice. Such a method is non-abrasive and will ensure the grain and any markings are preserved, ensuring their character and natural beauty is retained. These works are to be limited to the Dining Room, the Kitchen, and the Rear Hall only. We would ask that this item be the subject of a pre-commencement condition, with details of the methodology provided prior to the works being carried out.

External Works

1. We will omit the Study element from the rear extension, retaining the portion that extends the existing Kitchen. We disagree that the 1930s addition has already resulted in harm to the listed building, and therefore the inference that the rear extension is merely compounding this perceived harm. Since the extension is included within the Grade II listing, having not been specifically excluded, the building as a whole was deemed to be of special interest at the time of the listing, and accordingly the 1930s extension must form part of the baseline for assessing the impacts of the proposal on the scale and significance of the listed building. From the comments received, the 1930s element is one to which changes in general terms appear acceptable in principle, and therefore the proposed reduction in the scale of the extension must be deemed acceptable;
2. We are of the opinion that this aspect should be supported following the removal of the Study, since the objection appears to be based on cumulative impact, which the Study removal will significantly reduce;
3. We note the request to omit double glazing from the proposals, but we would ask that double glazing be allowed for the replacement windows to both the rear and to the south side elevations. To the rear, the majority of the existing windows form a part of the two-storey 1930s extension, which at External Works Point 1, above, is suggested as being a harmful addition to the listed addition. The impact on the surrounding properties and wider Conservation Area is minimal, and if the existing two-storey element is suggested to be harmful as it stands, then the sensitive replacement of the rear windows will not affect the quality or character of the rear elevation. To the south side elevation, the existing timber windows are in a poor condition, and their replacement with double glazed units will greatly improve their resistance to the prevailing elements;
4. We acknowledge the request to reduce the roof windows in size, and also to omit where required. These changes will be made to the scheme;
5. We note this item is acceptable, with details to be reserved by condition;
6. We note this item is acceptable, with details to be reserved by condition.

Works within the garden setting:

1. We note the comments made in respect of the extension, and can respond as follows:
 - The boundary line is on an angle that is not conducive to an extrapolation of the existing pitched roof form. The 'stepped in' arrangement proposed is, in our opinion, considered to be simpler, and result in building that is easier to construct and maintain;
 - The extension of the rear outshot of No.72 offers up a precedent for a linear extension to the outbuilding along the boundary. In assessing the impact of those proposals on the existing building it was noted that *'The proposed new outbuilding to the east of the existing rear range will be partially concealed in external views by the existing brick boundary wall between the site and Alma Road'*, and *'The building is relatively modest in scale, being appropriately subordinate to the existing rear range in height, and in terms of footprint having a relatively minor impact on the extent of the garden area remaining to the east of the house, which would remain extensive.'* The proposed extension will be concealed behind the boundary wall, is barely visible from the public realm, has a subservient roof form, and has a minor impact on the existing garden area, which too, will remain extensive;

- It is also noted that the addition to No.72 has gable glazing to its rear elevation, which in the case of Crosskeys has been deemed as not being in keeping. We believe the presence of such glazing at No.72 sets a strong precedent for its use at Crosskeys, and ask that this aspect be retained. The image is provided here:



- The butterfly pitched roof allows the extension to retain a subservience, mimicking the roof arrangement of the two-storey 1930s extension on the main house;
 - The solar PV panels can be positioned within the valley of the butterfly pitched roof, significantly reducing their visibility;
1. We note this item is acceptable, with details to be reserved by condition;
 2. We note this item is acceptable, with details to be reserved by condition;
 3. We note this item is acceptable, with details to be reserved by condition.

Conclusion

We thank Emily for her comments on the scheme, and we are pleased to see that many aspects of the scheme are considered acceptable. As noted above we will be undertaking a number of adjustments to make the scheme more acceptable where concerns have been raised. We are in the process of appointing a Structural Engineer to deal with the post and floor beam, and we would therefore be grateful for your agreement to an extension of time to allow this work to be carried out, and for us to make the various adjustments we have described.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards,

Rob

From: Andrew Horrell <Andrew.Horrell@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, September 9, 2026 3:33 PM
To: Rob Harrington <rh@gouldbaxter.co.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/26/1355 and 1356 Crosskeys, 76 High Street, LF (GH712)

Rob,

No problem, I look forward to receiving your response in due course.

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: Rob Harrington <rh@gouldbaxter.co.uk>
Sent: 09 September 2026 15:18
To: Andrew Horrell <Andrew.Horrell@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/26/1355 and 1356 Crosskeys, 76 High Street, LF (GH712)

Good afternoon Andrew,

I hope all is well?

Very many thanks for your email with comments from Emily Wade, much appreciated. I have passed these on to our Client and we will be reviewing them over the next couple of days. We would welcome the

opportunity to formulate a formal response with our suggestions, which I expect to issue during the course of next week.

I trust this will be acceptable, and I look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards,

Rob

From: Andrew Horrell <Andrew.Horrell@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2026 5:03 PM
To: Rob Harrington <rh@gouldbaxter.co.uk>
Subject: FW: DM/26/1355 and 1356 Crosskeys, 76 High Street, LF

Mr Harrington,

I have received comment from Emily Wade regarding the above application. I attach this for your reference.

As you will see once read, some concerns are raised and further information required in other places.

Let me know how you wish to proceed.

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



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.

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.