
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 13 July 2021

by Benjamin Webb BA(Hons) MA MA MSc PGDip(UD) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 September 2021

Appeal A: APP/L3815/W/21/3271173

Winkins Wood Farm, Shillinglee Road, Plaistow RH14 0PQ

- 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 Klaus Jensen against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref PS/20/02178/DOM, dated 28 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as extension and adaptation of modern northern wing including removal of conservatory and internal and external alterations.
-

Appeal B: APP/L3815/Y/21/3271176

Winkins Wood Farm, Shillinglee Road, Plaistow RH14 0PQ

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Klaus Jensen against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref PS/20/02179/LBC, dated 28 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 February 2021.
 - The works proposed are described as extension and adaptation of modern northern wing including removal of conservatory and internal and external alterations.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

3. As set out above, there are 2 appeals on this site. Each relates to the same scheme but they address separate applications for planning permission in the case of Appeal A, and listed building consent in the case of Appeal B. I have considered each on its individual merits, however, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the Appeals together, except where otherwise indicated.
4. During the course of the appeal a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. The parties were given the opportunity to comment, and I have taken any comments received into account in determining the appeals.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the scheme would preserve a Grade II listed building, or any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

6. The scheme relates to Winkins Wood Farm, which is a Grade II listed building. Insofar as it is relevant to this appeal, the special interest and significance of the listed building resides in its C17th or earlier origin, its timber framed front range with C19th extension to the rear, and its historic function as a farmhouse.
7. Modern extensions previously added to the rear of the historic farmhouse have roughly doubled the size of the building footprint. The largest of these extensions was added during the 1980s. Its details and materials generally reflect those of the historic farmhouse. However, whilst the width of the extension is markedly less than that of the front range, and its height is generally no greater, its depth, scale and form cause it to appear like a second attached dwelling. Its relationship with the historic farmhouse cannot therefore be considered 'subservient'. Relative compactness in terms of width does however mean that whilst the extension is apparent in views of the front range from the south/southwest, it does not directly challenge the prominence of the latter within these views. Perception clearly changes moving around the building, with the extension increasingly dominating the view. This in turn increasingly detracts from appreciation of the significance of the listed building.
8. The second addition, which consists of a large single storey conservatory with terrace, is attached to the southeast side of the 1980s extension, and is of fairly recent origin. The design and appearance of the conservatory bears no relation to that of the historic farmhouse or the 1980s extension. As such, it is wholly incongruous. The extent of its projection from the southeast elevation of the extension furthermore undermines its compactness, intruding upon views of the front range from the south. As both existing extensions therefore give rise to harm, it follows that some potential exists to better reveal the significance of a heritage asset through alterations which reduce or mitigate this harm.
9. The scheme would see the conservatory and much of the 1980s extension effectively replaced by a new structure. The resulting loss of modern fabric would not give rise to any harm. Nor would any historic fabric be lost. In this regard the issue is whether the replacement structure would itself be appropriate.
10. The scheme would see the overall footprint, scale and massing of modern additions each significantly increased. This would be a product of the greater depth and width of the new structure; the replacement of the conservatory across most of its footprint with built form standing at 1.5 storeys; and the introduction of a far more substantial roof form at the northeast end of the building.
11. The proposed width and massing of the northeast end of the building would indeed exceed that of the front range of the historic farmhouse. Its projection to the north west, well beyond the compact line of the 1980s extension, would

thus cause it to directly encroach upon views of the front range from the southwest. This encroachment would not be meaningfully reduced by perspective or distance, particularly when additionally recognising the fact that the listed building is not experienced statically, or from a fixed viewpoint. In this regard the enlarged northeast end of the building would also appear highly conspicuous viewed from the access to the north. From this viewpoint the historic end of the building would appear as somewhat of an appendage to a larger modern dwelling.

12. The replacement structure would appear reasonably coherent in terms of its style and materials, thus addressing the current visual incongruity of the conservatory. The increased height and massing of the replacement structure would however substantially increase the physical and visual presence of modern built form on the southeast side of the building. This would again see movement away from the simpler compact lines of the 1980s extension, so exacerbating the adverse visual effects which arise from the current projection of the conservatory from the southeast elevation. The result would again be more substantial encroachment on views of the main range from the south, and increased visual competition between modern and historic components of the building. The adverse effects would be far more substantial than those which arise from the current conservatory. The benefits of removing the conservatory would therefore be outweighed by the harm that the replacement structure would cause.
13. In view of the above, the already strained balance between the historic building and modern additions would be tipped well in favour of the latter. As appreciation of the identity, prominence and historic status of the listed building would be far more greatly undermined than it is at present, it is clear that the scheme would fail to better reveal the significance of the listed building.
14. The scheme would include the insertion of French doors and several bi-fold glazed panels. This would give the remodelled and enlarged modern end of the building a less 'traditional' appearance than the 1980s design. The area of glazing would nonetheless be smaller than that of the removed conservatory, and more sensitively detailed. Though the glazing would therefore be acceptable, this would not make the scheme any more acceptable as a whole.
15. In view of my findings above, the scheme would not preserve the listed building, which would be contrary to the expectations of the Act. With reference to the Framework, I find that the harm caused to the significance of the listed building would be less than substantial. I attach great weight to this harm. In accordance with paragraph 202 of the Framework, it is necessary to balance this harm against the public benefits advanced in favour of the scheme.
16. Insofar as improvements resulting from removal of the conservatory have been advanced as a benefit, I have considered this matter above. Having found the effects to be harmful overall, I attach no weight to this consideration.
17. The scheme would provide expanded domestic accommodation. However, as this would be a private rather than public benefit, it again attracts no weight.
18. The scheme would generate building work. The broader economic benefits of this would however be negligible in scale. They therefore attract negligible

weight. The public benefits of the scheme are therefore insufficient to outweigh the harm that it would cause. This provides a clear indication that the appeals should be dismissed.

19. For the reasons outlined above I conclude that the scheme would not preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building. In relation to Appeal A it would therefore conflict with Policy 47 of the Chichester Local Plan 2014-2029, which states that planning permission will be granted where it can be demonstrated that a proposal conserves and enhances the special interest of designated heritage assets. With regard to both Appeal A and Appeal B, the scheme would otherwise fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, and heritage policy set out within the Framework.

Other Matters

20. Three types of bat have been identified at the site, all of which are recorded as having day roosts in the modern northern end of the building. Bats are a protected species, and all three types identified could be adversely affected by the scheme. Had I been minded to allow the appeals, and the circumstances therefore existing within which planning permission and listed building consent could be granted, it would have been necessary to consider this matter in greater detail. However, as I am dismissing the appeals for other reasons I need consider it no further.

Conclusion

21. The scheme would fail to preserve the listed building, and in relation to Appeal A, conflict arises with the development plan. There are no other considerations which alter or outweigh these findings. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that Appeals A and B should be dismissed.

Benjamin Webb

INSPECTOR