
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 16 September 2016

by Kenneth Stone BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21 September 2016

Appeal A: APP/M3645/W/16/3148992

Lullenden Manor, Hollow Lane, East Grinstead, Surrey RH19 3PT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Matthew Ferrey against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2015/1080, dated 05 June 2015, was refused by notice dated 02 February 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey conservatory and first floor extension to rear elevation.
-

Appeal B: APP/M3645/Y/16/3149018

Lullenden Manor, Hollow Lane, East Grinstead, Surrey RH19 3PT

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Matthew Ferrey against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2015/1105, dated 05 June 2015, was refused by notice dated 02 February 2016.
 - The works proposed are the erection of a single storey conservatory and first floor extension to rear elevation.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey conservatory and first floor extension to rear elevation at Lullenden Manor, Hollow Lane, East Grinstead, Surrey RH19 3PT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref TA/2015/1080, dated 05 June 2015, subject to the following conditions contained in the schedule at the end of this decision.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for the erection of a single storey conservatory and first floor extension to rear elevation at Lullenden Manor, Hollow Lane, East Grinstead, Surrey RH19 3PT in accordance with the terms of the application Ref TA/2015/1105, dated 05 June 2015 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions contained in the schedule at the end of this decision.
-

Procedural matters

3. I have taken the description of the proposals from the Council's decision notice as this more accurately and concisely describes the proposals.
4. The appeals before me relate to an application for planning permission and an application for Listed Building Consent for the same proposals to this grade II listed building. I note that the Council ticked the box on the questionnaire identifying the building as Grade II* however the list description provided with the documents confirm its status as Grade II. In the context of these appeals I have had regard to my statutory duties under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended, at sections 16(2) and 66(1). These require that I have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses when considering whether to grant both planning permission and listed building consent.
5. I also note that the building is located in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which has its own statutory and policy requirements. However, the Council has not raised this as an issue and given the scale and nature of the proposal I see no reason to disagree with them.

Main Issue

6. Following on from above the main issue in these appeals is the effect of the proposals on any features of special architectural or historic interest of the Grade II listed building and its setting.

Reasons

7. Lullenden Manor House is described in the listing description as a 15 century house with 16th century extensions, which has been extended to incorporate an Oast house in the 20 century. The listing also notes considerable quantities of framing exposed internally, a two bay great hall with a crown post roof and a fire place surround dated 1624. It further notes that the house was occupied by Winston Churchill for about 5 years.
8. The proposals seek to extend a gable end extension at first floor level, add a conservatory and make internal alterations to incorporate the new extensions into the building.
9. There is some dispute between the parties as to the nature of the evolution of the property and its history of alterations. There is no dispute that it has undergone considerable alteration and extension and the main divergence appears to be around the latter years and the use to which parts of the building may have been put.
10. There is no doubt that the most significant element of the building in terms of historical and architectural quality is the 15th century great hall. There are also alterations and additions around the start of the 20th century, 1910/11 when the main cross wing was constructed. This is evidenced on a 1912 OS map. The parties note Churchill's occupation up to around 1919 but do not identify this as an important contributor to the significance of this building. The appellant notes that following a change in ownership further alterations and extensions, that joined the building and the Oast House, were undertaken

sometime between 1919 and the mid 1930's, this is illustrated by reference to photographic evidence.

11. It is around these later alterations where there is some disagreement between the parties. Not necessarily in dating the alterations but in terms of the intended purpose and use. The Council contend that the Oast house and connection included the servant quarters of the Edwardian Manor and that there was a more utilitarian finish to the building and design to reflect this. The appellant sees no evidence of this and suggests it more likely the kitchen and staff quarters were in the eastern end of the main house where there is evidence of a large fireplace. I find the evidence of the appellant is more convincing.
12. There are then modern alterations that have taken place to add a gable feature to extend the living space in the main house and to add doors to the under pass of the first floor link between the Oast house and the main house.
13. It is evident that there is significant value in historical and architectural terms for the main great hall, that the early 20th century additions have good historical and evidential value as to the evolution of the house, and along with the Oast House contribute to the significance of the building. I agree with the appellant that the mid-19th century alterations are of less value but still contribute evidential value to the evolution of the house.
14. The proposed first floor extension would alter a gable ended two storey bay added in 2006 and would therefore not affect any historic fabric. The existing feature is already a large feature on the elevation but the proposed alteration would not substantially increase the bulk or mass of that feature. The slight increase in depth of the first floor would retain the overall elevational appearance and the small element of roof that would be lost, that above the deeper ground floor element, would be inconsequential in the scale and appearance of the feature or the elevation as a whole. This would not change the nature or general appearance of the building and would not reduce the Edwardian mock tudor appearance that has been produced.
15. Moving to the conservatory, this again is proposed in a location where there have been significant modern works undertaken. The conservatory would attach to the building at the bay added in 2006 and would be accessed principally through alterations to that part of the building, or through alterations to the extensions added in the mid 20 century. There would therefore be no harm to significant fabric. The conservatory is a modest structure the design scale and form of which is not out of keeping with the architectural expression of the rear elevation.
16. The Council has not produced any evidence to underpin its assertion of the use of the building and its view as to the historic use of the building for this part of its history. But in any event this would not be harmed by the minor extensions proposed. The proposed conservatory would not link the Oast house and main house functionally but allow for the outside area to be used as an outside room. The structural elements of the building that are retained would retain the legibility of the different elements, and the separation of the main house and Oast house sections would still remain discernable. The retained doors to the undercroft at the front of the building and the overall form of the conservatory room, its dimensions and shape would continue to reveal the separation of the buildings and the historical evolution of the

building. On this basis there would be no harm to the significance of the building.

17. Drawing all this together I am satisfied that the proposals would not harm the significance of the listed building, the special architectural and historic interest of which would be preserved. On this basis the proposals comply with the National Planning Policy Framework, and paragraphs 132 to 134 are not engaged as no harm occurs to the significance of the building. I am therefore also satisfied that the proposals would comply with policy DP7 and DP20 of the Tandridge District Local Plan which seek to protect and preserve heritage assets and ensure extensions are of a high quality design.

Conclusions and conditions

18. The Council has not provided a list of suggested conditions but given the nature and scale of the proposals I am satisfied that there are only general conditions required in the context of approved plans and materials. These need only be applied to the planning permission. The Listed Building Consent makes reference to the approved plans in the decision and therefore an approved plans condition is not required on that decision and there is no need to duplicate the materials condition from the planning permission. The only other condition required is in relation to making good, where the conservatory attaches to the listed building, otherwise no further conditions are required.

19. For the reasons given above I conclude that both the appeals should succeed.

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions for Appeal A APP/M3645/W/16/3148992

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Numbers 2683: 100 Rev A; 2683: 101 Rev A; 2683: 102; 2683: 103 Rev A; 2683: 104; 2683: 105 Rev A; 2683: 106 Rev A; 2683: 107; and 2683: 108.
- 3) No development shall commence until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.

Schedule of conditions for Appeal A APP/M3645/W/16/3149018

- 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
- 2) Upon completion of the works authorised by this consent, any damage caused to the building in the course of carrying out the works shall be made good in accordance with a scheme submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

END