
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

by Cullum J A Parker BA(Hons) MA MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 10th August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/Y/17/3171344

Lullenden Manor, Hollow Lane, East Grinstead, 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 Ferrey against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application Ref TA/2016/2300, dated 9 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 March 2017.
 - The works proposed are described as '*removal of discrete sections of wall in the family room/conservatory following receipt of planning approval ref TA/2015.1080 and Listed Building Consent ref TA/2015/1105*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed works would preserve the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a Grade II listed building, with elements likely to date from the 15th Century onwards, including two bays of a medieval hall with crown post roof. The Council has identified that the significance of the listed building stems from four key factors. Put simply, the 15th Century Hall, fragments of 17th Century work, the 18th/19th Century oast house, and lastly the Edwardian alterations and mock Tudor dressing up of the building. These reflect the main historic elements of the building and the key epochs of its evolution. I agree that it is from these four factors the historic significance of the listed building derives.
4. The proposal would see the removal of sections of walls in order to create a larger room area, in support of an earlier scheme for a conservatory allowed at appeal (ref 2015/1105 and appeal ref 3148992 and 3149018). In terms of the significance of the listed building, the proposal would not materially affect the historic core of the building, being its medieval hall component for example, and in this respect the first three aspects of its significance would not be harmed as a result of this proposal.
5. In terms of the fourth strand of significance identified by the Council, relating to the Edwardian elements, the Historic Buildings Officer points to the Edwardian kitchen fireplace and that the location of the Edwardian kitchen is

fundamental to understanding how the house functioned in this period. Having visited the site, I did not see any visible evidence of the Edwardian fireplace the Council refer to or that this area was used as a kitchen at that time. Indeed, it is clear that these have already been altered so that to most observers they would not appear as an Edwardian kitchen.

6. Nevertheless, the usage of the area as a kitchen is of interest insofar as it tells the story of how the building evolved over time. The lack of legibility today in terms of its former use mean that its contribution to the last strand of significance is diminished. However, from the submitted drawings it appears as though the Edwardian fireplace has been retained, albeit concealed behind a stud wall. I am not able to discern whether or not the fireplace is still in situ or whether there is little more than a void behind this wall. Given the statutory protection afforded to listed buildings, and the absence of any clear consent for its removal, it is logical to consider that the fireplace is still retained behind the stud wall.
7. The Council is concerned that the removal of other walls to create a larger family room would mean that future generations would be unable to see the evolution of the building in terms of the different periods of construction. They have also directed me to Paragraph 16 of the Inspector's decisions¹, where on allowing the appeals, the Inspector found that the *'overall form conservatory, its dimensions and shape would continue to reveal the separation of the buildings and historical evolution of the building.'* The removal of the walls sought in this case would drastically alter this relationship. No longer would the viewer be able to easily see the distinct separation between the oast house and the main building, connected by a short length of timbered conservatory.
8. Instead the proposal would see the creation of a large 'Family Room' with steel beams clad in oak and the creation of an oddly shaped coats cupboard. In particular, the coats cupboard would create an odd wedge-shaped stud wall partition directly in front of the location of the Edwardian fireplace, as shown on Drawing No. 200. In doing so, this would make it harder for future generations to see this aspect of the floorplan, as and when this aspect of the heritage asset might reasonably be better revealed in the future.
9. The new wall proposed in this position would make any realistic prospect of the fireplace being restored, revealed or otherwise very unlikely. The new wall to create the coats cupboard, together with the creation of a large room through the loss of existing historic walls, would have a negative impact on the plan form of the building and result in a mis-representation of its evolutionary history; particularly in terms of its more recent early 20th Century and Edwardian period history. Accordingly, it would have an adverse impact on the significance of the listed building.
10. In such circumstances, the retention of the overall plan form and the walls to be lost, are an important feature of the listed building. Their loss would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building. In doing so, the proposed works would fail to achieve the statutory duty set out in Section 16(2) of the *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990*. For similar reasons, I find that the proposal would be contrary to Policy DP20 of the *Tandridge Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014-2029*, 2014 and the

¹ Refs 3148992 and 3149018

Policies of the *National Planning Policy Framework* which seek similar aims to those set out in the statutory duty.

11. Whilst I acknowledge the public benefits of ensuring the listed building remains to be used for day-to-day living, these are benefits which are not wholly reliant on the changes to the current plan form of the building.
12. For the reasons given above, and having taken into account all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

Cullum J A Parker

INSPECTOR