

This is not a Major Development, but falls within the Angmering Conservation area.

The existing building is NOT Listed. See copy Appeal Decision dated 13 august 1999 attached for further guidance.

Design Principles & Concepts.

Very considerable thought has been given to this plan to not only fit in with this part of the conservation area, but to make this building complimentary to Littleworth House, notwithstanding the size & appearance of Carlton Cottage which adjoins this development.

This small building of 94.5 sqM will be constructed of predominantly flint walls & brick dressings, wood framed windows & doors. The existing flint wall facing the High St, will not be breached. There will be no windows on the West side. The wall dividing this from Littleworth House will be of flint & brick construction & about 2m in height.

As much of the dwelling will be of single story construction & within the existing roadside wall, which is 2.10m high, the changed visual impact from the road will be minimal

Access

This is through the existing garage & door leading to the garden.

There are no issues arising & further consultation has not been needed.



Appeal Decision

site visit held on Thursday 29 July 1999

by A J Bingham TD Dipl Arch ARIBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for the
Environment, Transport and the Regions

The Planning Inspectorate
Tollgate House,
Houlton Street
Bristol BS2 9DJ
☎ 0117 987 8927

13 AUG 1999

Appeal Ref: T/APP/C3810/A/99/1022971/P2

- The appeal is made by Mr R Thomas under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal of outline planning permission by the Arun District Council.
- The site is located at Littleworth House, High Street, Angmering, West Sussex.
- The application Ref: A/140/98, dated 1 December 1998, was refused on 8 April 1999.
- The development proposed, as shown on the amended application form, is: "the conversion and extension of an existing garage to form a dwelling and construction of a garage to serve Littleworth House (this is an outline application)".

Decision: The Appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

1. The Council has accepted the application in outline form, and has not requested supporting details in view of its opposition to the principle of the proposal. In the grounds of appeal the plans submitted with the appeal form are referred to as part of a preliminary enquiry, suggesting that they are not part of the application. Despite this, they are mentioned in the grounds of appeal to illustrate the height of the proposed ridge and the absence of windows in the west wall of the proposed development. Insofar as the application includes operational development in the form of an extension to an existing building, I also intend to rely on the drawings submitted with the appeal as a basis for assessing the appeal proposal.
2. A letter forming part of the application, and the description of the proposed development on the application originally submitted, state that the building proposed to be extended is a historic building, which was formerly a dwelling. Later correspondence suggests that it was a 19th century barn. These claims are disputed by the Council. The building might have functioned as an outbuilding to Littleworth House prior to its uses as a garage. However, on the basis of the documentary evidence submitted by a neighbouring land owner, I find the claims that the building was formerly a dwelling or a barn unfounded.
3. Littleworth House forms part of a building included in the Statutory List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest. It stands in the Angmering Conservation Area. In view of these matters I am obliged to have regard to the provisions of Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 in deciding this appeal.

The appeal site and its surroundings

4. The appeal site lies near the east end of Angmering High Street. It consists of the western part of the garden of Littleworth House, comprising a plot of some 0.04 ha which presents a frontage of about 20 m to the north side of the highway. At the south-west corner of the site is a single storey building about 5m wide used as a domestic garage. Except for the

frontage of this garage, which contains a metal up and over door, the whole of the existing frontage of Littleworth House is divided from the public highway by a flint wall somewhat in excess of 2 m in height. The general level of the site is some 1 m above the level of the High Street. Adjoining the site to the east is the remainder of the garden of Littleworth House, a 19th century 2-storey dwelling constructed with flint walls with brick dressings and a roof covered with clay plain tiles. Flanking the site to the west and north is the curtilage of Carlton Cottage, a substantial 2-storey modern house. Facing across the High Street are the extensive curtilages of other residential properties.

The main issues

5. From my inspection of the site and its surroundings, and the representations made, I consider that the main issues on which a decision turns are whether or not the proposed development would: firstly, harm the setting of the Grade II listed building, of which Littleworth House forms part; secondly, erode the residential amenities of the adjoining property, Carlton Cottage; and thirdly detract from the appearance of the Angmering Conservation Area.

The development plan

6. The development plan in operation in this area comprises the approved West Sussex Structure Plan 1993 and the adopted Arun District Local Plan 1993. In support of its decision the Council places reliance on various development plan policies. In the case of the structure plan the Council rests on those policies that provide for the conservation of the best buildings in the county, and for high standards of care for the fabric and settings of buildings and for open spaces in historic town centres. Relevant local plan policies are those that provide for general controls over development, and in the context of development proposals, for consideration of special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing conservation areas.
7. The Council also places reliance on certain policies in the West Sussex Structure Plan 1998 and the deposit draft of the Arun District Local Plan Review, which update and carry forward many of the policies in the approved and adopted plans. The structure plan review is at a more advanced stage in its progression towards formal adoption than the local plan review. However, neither of these plans has been formally adopted, and while I accept that they are material considerations, they cannot be afforded the weight of the statutory development plan.

Inspector's reasoning

Consideration of the first issue

8. The first reason for refusal alleges that the appeal proposal necessitates significant extension to the existing structure. However, the Council does not argue that it is opposed to the proposal in land-use terms. Neither do I consider that such opposition would be appropriate in view of the location of the site within the settlement of Angmering. The appeal site forms part of the curtilage of Littleworth House, and this area of garden would be lost to the listed building if the site were developed as proposed. Notwithstanding this loss, and despite the substantial curtilage of the adjoining property Carlton Cottage, it seems to me that the area that would be retained by Littleworth House would reflect the general plot size of dwellings in the immediate locality. I am also satisfied that the residual area of garden

would be demolished. A further breach approaching 1 m wide would be made to provide access to the appeal site.

14. In my view, by virtue of piecemeal subdivision, and removal of a substantial area of wall, the proposed breaches would spoil the visual contribution the wall makes to the Angmering Conservation Area, thereby unacceptably detracting from its appearance, contrary to Policies EVT7(iii) and EVT8 of the adopted local plan. Policy B4 of the approved structure plan provides for the conservation of the fabric and scale of the environment in historic towns, and is also applicable to larger villages. Angmering may not be one of these larger villages, but I consider that the proposal fails to accord with the spirit of this policy. Having regard to Section 54A of the Act, no material considerations have been adduced to cause me to arrive at a decision other than in accordance with the development plan.

Consideration of other matters

15. It is contended that the garage building on the site is of listable quality, and therefore qualifies to be considered under those policies that countenance conversion of listed buildings. Although the building stands within the curtilage of a listed building, I do not agree that the garage building is listable in its own right, neither is there evidence to this effect. It is further suggested that the building also qualifies for conversion under the guidance in PPG7, but I reject this view as the site is within a settlement. The building at the site is not a rural building to which the advice on conversions in PPG7 applies.
16. I have examined the conditions suggested by the Council for imposition on the grant of planning permission in the event of the appeal being allowed. They have no bearing on my decision as they would merely provide for the timing of the submission of the reserved matters and controls over the development, and not the means to ameliorate the effects of the planning objection I have identified. I have taken into account all the other matters raised in the written representations but I do not find them of such importance as to outweigh the considerations that have led to my decision.

Conclusions

17. For the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I hereby dismiss this appeal.



A J BINGHAM TD Dipl Arch ARIBA MRTPI
Inspector