
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 14 July 2020

by H Butcher BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2020

Appeal A Ref: APP/L3815/W/20/3245219

Pond Cottage, Camelsdale Road, Camelsdale, Linchmere GU27 3RB

- 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 & Mrs F Lerche Lerchenborg against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref LM/19/02811/DOM, dated 11 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to north elevation, replacement of existing flat roof extension to the south east and internal alterations including the replacement of the 20th Century staircase, opening of original doorway and blocking of doorway to south of dining room.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/L3815/Y/20/3245220

Pond Cottage, Camelsdale Road, Camelsdale, Linchmere GU27 3RB

- 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 F Lerche Lerchenborg against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref LM/19/02812/LBC, dated 11 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 January 2020.
 - The works proposed are a single storey extension to north elevation, replacement of existing flat roof extension to the south east and internal alterations including the replacement of the 20th Century staircase, opening of original doorway and blocking of doorway to south of dining room.
-

Decision

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. There is variation in the spelling of the appellant's surname in the evidence before me. I have therefore gone with the spelling on the application form.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed works on the special architectural and historic interest of Pond Cottage which is Grade II listed, and linked to that whether they would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Cammelsdale and Hammer Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. Pond Cottage is a house dating from the 18th Century. The west elevation is largely unchanged from its initial construction and directly addresses the upper of two, so called, Shottermill Ponds. Part of the significance of the property is derived from the age, form, fabric and architectural features of the west elevation as viewed in the context of the pond to the front. This view can be clearly seen from Camelsdale Road and as such it contributes to the significance of the Camelsdale and Hammer Conservation Area (CA).
5. The proposed works include a single storey extension which would have a relatively modern roof form comprising a low hipped roof behind which would be concealed a flat roof. The appeal property has a mixture of fully pitched gables and half hips therefore the proposed roof would appear out of keeping with these. It would also partially obscure a small bedroom window in the side elevation detracting from this architectural detail.
6. In addition to the above it is proposed to subdivide the existing kitchen into a utility and WC. This would involve the construction of a partition wall that would bisect the existing kitchen window in two. The window in question is of some age and was not originally designed to be split in two. Such a change, even if reversible, would be apparent internally and also externally and would detract from the special historic and architectural interest of the property.
7. The appellant refers to planning permission and listed building consent at the appeal property for a similar extension, in the same location. I have not been provided with full details of this permission, but it is clear from the evidence before me that was designed with a more traditional lean-to roof, which would be less harmful than the roof form before me. I also note that the above permission does not result in the same bisection of the kitchen window. This fallback position does not, therefore, alter my findings above.
8. For these reasons the proposed works would detract from the special architectural and historic interest of the cottage. The extension would also be clearly visible from across the pond and as such would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the CA. In addition to this the proposal would conflict with Policy 47 of the Chichester Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) both of which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment. The harm I have found would be 'less than substantial' for the purposes of para 196 of the Framework given the scale of works and their range of impact. Any such harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
9. The appellant states that the proposal is a more sympathetic addition to the principal elevation of the property than the above fallback position due to the use of traditional materials and conventional roof profiles but given my findings above I disagree. Consequently, I find no public benefits to outweigh the harm that I have found.
10. The appeals are dismissed.

Hayley Butcher

INSPECTOR