
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 29 October 2019

by S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 November 2019

Appeal A: APP/L3815/W/19/3232234

8 Parchment Street, Chichester PO19 3DA

- 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 Mrs Linda Carline against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref CC/19/00767/DOM, dated 14 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey kitchen extension.
-

Appeal B: APP/L3815/Y/19/3232233

8 Parchment Street, Chichester PO19 3DA

- 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 Mrs Linda Carline against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref CC/19/00768/LBC, dated 14 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2019.
 - The works proposed are single storey kitchen extension.
-

Decisions

1. I dismiss both appeals.

Main Issue

2. In both appeals the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the architectural or historic significance of the Grade II Listed Building and the character and appearance of the Chichester Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. Policy 47 of the Chichester Local Plan on heritage and design states that planning permission will be granted where it can be demonstrated that all of the 4 criteria have been met and the Policy's supporting guidance followed. The first criterion concerns the conservation of the special interest of designated heritage assets.
4. The building is listed along with 8 to 13 Parchment Street and sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require 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. 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. Paragraph 193 of the 2019 National Planning Policy Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

5. Although numbers 8 to 13 are listed together and form a terrace of similar dwellings, there are differences in that the two-colour patterned brick frontage remains only on numbers 9 and 11, while numbers 10, 12 and 13 have been painted and the appeal property, number 8, at the north-east end of the terrace has been rendered and scribed as ashlar on all 3 elevations. To the rear the other houses visible from the site and the road appear to retain a flint cobble wall and brick window reveals. The distinctive brick dentil course and roof forms however unify the terrace both front and back and these are significant features of the building and the conservation area.
6. To the side of number 8 and forming a frontage to the adjoining Cavendish Street there is a flint cobble wall that is also an attractive feature of the area and one that adds substantially to the character and appearance of the designated area and to the architectural and historic significance of the listed building. The wall provides a boundary to the rear garden of the appeal property and being backed by the open space of the garden or rear yard, clearly delineates the extent of the historic building, and the low rearward projection presently in place does not erode that expression of the free-standing wall being the boundary to the garden or yard.
7. The proposed extension would sit on the footprint of the existing rearward part-width projection but would occupy the full width of the house to abut the flint boundary wall. Due to an overlap of the neighbouring rear addition roof, the existing line of the south-west facing roof and ridge would be retained, the north-east facing roof being elongated and shallower in order to cover the wider footprint. Two rooflights would be placed onto that longer roof plane facing Cavendish Street.
8. This arrangement ensures that the ridge remains lower than the first-floor window cills, whereas a suggested change shown on drawings suffixed 'Rev A' would entail a ridge that would visually interfere with those windows and be more intrusive in the street-scene but would allow the rooflights to be on the plane away from the road. Be that as it may, the arrangement considered by the Council is that on the unrevised drawings and the appeal will consider those proposals.
9. The layout would place the gutter and eaves of the addition in close proximity but above the flint boundary wall and would detract from the expression of that wall as a boundary. The long roof plane would appear out of balance with the roof forms of the houses and the insertion of rooflights would draw attention to the bulk of the addition and introduce a discordant feature on the listed building and within the conservation area.
10. Turning to the risk identified by the Council of the new north-east wall damaging the flint boundary wall, the details are lacking and although conditions could be used to require clarification, it is not possible to be certain what those details may be and the extent that they might visually affect the presentation of the wall or physically harm its integrity. The options appear to be a direct connection in which case some flashings may be required, or a suitable gap, which should preferably be wide enough to allow inspection and

repair of the inside face of the boundary wall as and when required; a small gap would risk long term lack of maintenance and harm through such neglect.

11. However, the harm identified by the presence of the roof as designed so close to the wall and being a discordant feature together with the rooflights mean that resolution of the finer detail of the wall-to-roof junction would not overcome the other failings. The design of the addition would cause harm to the significance of the listed building and in this highly visible location would fail to preserve either the character or the appearance of the Chichester Conservation Area.
12. The level of harm would be 'less than substantial', a differentiation required between paragraphs 195 and 196 of the Framework. In this case the latter applies and this states that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
13. The desire to increase the floor area of the dwelling is of limited public benefit and insufficient to outweigh the harm, and the need for rooflights to provide adequate light to the wide and deep plan form in place of the large windows along the north-east elevation of the existing addition is a consequence of that enlarged plan form; there may be less obtrusive ways of providing light but they would not overcome the adverse effect on the boundary wall.
14. The existing north-east wall of the rear addition shows some sign of damp, and the proposed works would remove that wall and give the opportunity of rectifying the problem, which would assist the preservation of the listed building as a public benefit. That damp could however be addressed without the need for the size and detailed design of the addition proposed, and hence limited weight attaches to that benefit.
15. To conclude, the proposal causes harm to the listed building and the conservation area that is not outweighed by public benefits or otherwise justified, contrary to the local and national policies previously cited and the proposal does not satisfy the statutory tests in the 1990 Act. For the reasons given above it is concluded that both appeals should be dismissed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR