
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2016

by S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA

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

Decision date: 11 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/Y/16/3149978

Butchers, Ryecroft Road, Bolney, West Sussex RH17 5PS

- 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 & Mrs John Hawkin against the decision of Mid Sussex District Council.
 - The application Ref DM/15/4885, dated 7 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2016.
 - The works proposed are extension to first floor of annexe with alterations to roof profile.
-

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant listed building consent for extension to first floor of annexe with alterations to roof profile at Butchers, Ryecroft Road, Bolney, West Sussex RH17 5PS in accordance with the terms of the application Ref DM/15/4885, dated 7 December 2015 and the plans submitted with it subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the works hereby approved shall match those used previously on the adjacent part of the building and shall be incorporated so as to not show a visual junction.
 - 3) The extension hereby approved shall not be occupied until the part-hip ends to both ends of the annexe roof shall have been constructed in accordance with details shown on submitted plans numbered 393lb01, 02, 03 and 04.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposed works on the significance of the listed building and the character and appearance of the Bolney Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The building is listed Grade II and section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The site is within the Bolney Conservation Area and Section 72(1) of the same Act requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
-

4. Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the assets' conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. The courts have determined that considerable importance and weight should be given to harm found to the significance of listed buildings.
5. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 does not apply to applications and appeals made under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, but the following Development Plan policies are material considerations. Policy B10 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan seeks the protection of listed buildings; alterations and extensions to Listed Buildings which would adversely affect their historic or architectural character will not be permitted. Alterations and extensions should normally be subservient to the original building so as not to dominate the building's character and appearance. The Bolney Neighbourhood Plan was 'made' on 22 September 2016 and is now part of the Development Plan covering the site. Policy BOLD1 requires development to be designed to a high quality which reflects Bolney's rural nature and responds to the heritage and distinctive character.
6. Policy DP32 of the emerging District Plan requires the protection of listed buildings and their settings through an understanding of their significance and alterations or extensions to a listed building are to respect its historic form, scale, setting, significance and fabric.
7. The original historic building has been substantially extended over time, to either end of the main range, and by a large addition to the south-east. The most recent change stated in the Council Report being the addition of a single storey extension to the east elevation and internal alterations to the 20th century addition, granted permission and consent on 11 March 2015 (Refs; DM/15/0057 and DM/15/0059). This work was complete at the time of the site inspection, although the previously submitted photographs show the pre-existing situation. It appears that this extension was originally proposed to include the additions that are the subject of this appeal but these were removed on advice from the Council.
8. This single storey addition has extended the built form further from the truly historic part, and the Council accept that the later additions between it and the main house have limited historic significance. That view is concurred with now, and further to that, the form of the roof to the two storey part is at odds with that of the main house with the termination as a full gable end appearing abrupt and uncompromising, detracting from the clear historic and architectural interest of the historic main house. The short length for its height appears to unbalance the composition and hence attract the eye away from the house. The use of differing materials does however serve to reinforce the fact that this is a later addition.
9. The proposed alteration to the roof termination to provide part-hip ends would soften the effect and resonate attractively with the roof form of the house without vying for attention with it. With that as an essential part of the works, the increase in length would not appear over-dominant in views from within the site or as available more fleetingly from Ryecroft Road and through gaps from The Street. Again the use of differing materials would signal this as a more recent intervention to the building's history and the strong lines and historic

detailing of the main house, and in particular the Horsham flag roofing would ensure that this remains the dominant presence and the annexe a subservient element, albeit slightly less so than previously permitted. Materials could be secured by condition as could an acceptable 'invisible' junction.

10. To conclude, the further addition to the annexe at first floor level, with the part-hip ends secured by condition, would not undermine the historic integrity of the listed building and would preserve the character and appearance of the Bolney Conservation Area. The statutory tests in the 1990 Act and the requirements of the Framework would be met, and the proposal accords with the aims of Development Plan and emerging policies as appropriate. As there is no identified harm there is no need to address the provisions of even the lesser level of paragraph 134 of the Framework, but there are benefits of the building continuing to provide for the needs of the present owners who appear to be caring for the building as a public heritage asset. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR