



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 23 September 2021

by J Reid BA(Hons) BArch(Hons) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/D/21/3275601

The Coach House, 2 Manor Road, Selsey PO20 0SD

- 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 Alan Swatton of CrispClean Ltd against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref SY/21/00207/DOM, dated 25 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2021.
 - The development is "Replacement of roof to excising out buildings, built in 2003. The roof needed replacing due to structural damage, weather damage and water leaks. The existing roof comprised of a timber frame with polycarbonate plastic clear sheets and roofing felt shingle covering. The replacement roof consists of steel purlins and a box profile steel roofing sheets. The increased height to the middle of the roof is to allow rain water to run freely off the roof. Increased length to the West elevation was to align the building with the excising garage".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for replacement of roof to existing outbuildings at The Coach House, 2 Manor Road, Selsey PO20 0SD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref SY/21/00207/DOM, dated 25 January 2021, and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the development used in the banner heading above has been taken from the application form. However, for clarity, the development can be more simply described as 'replacement of roof to existing outbuildings', and I have used that in the Decision above. The development has been carried out.
3. The Council says that the size and scale of the existing building has accrued over time and much of it, including its previous roof, appears to have been in place before the designation of the Old Selsey Conservation Area in 2017.
4. The Council's reason for refusal refers to Policies 1 and 2 of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 (LP). LP Policy 1 reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and LP Policy 2 sets out the development strategy and settlement hierarchy for the District. The Council states that, as the site falls within the Selsey Settlement Boundary Area, the principle of a replacement roof is acceptable, subject to compliance with the Development Plan and other material considerations. So, LP Policies 1 and 2 are not the most relevant Policies in this appeal.

Main Issue

5. The appeal site is situated close to the junction of Manor Road and East Street. It is outside but next to the Conservation Area. The Fisherman's Joy Public House and 77 East Street are listed in Grade II, and they are situated nearby within the Conservation Area. With this in mind, the main issues are the effect that the development has on the setting of the Conservation Area, and whether the settings of the listed buildings at The Fisherman's Joy Public House and 77 East Street are preserved.

Reasons

6. The site includes the dwelling at The Coach House and outbuildings in its grounds at the back, and it is largely enclosed by tall boundary treatment. The nearby development in Manor Road mainly includes semidetached and detached dwellings. The site faces Manor Road to roughly north west, and it is adjoined by a steelwork business on a long narrow plot to roughly north east, back gardens of dwellings in Gainsborough Drive to roughly south east, and the grounds of The Fisherman's Joy Public House to roughly south west. The north corner of the garden of 79 East Street, which is partly behind 77 East Street, adjoins or is close to the roughly south corner of the site.
7. The Old Selsey Conservation Area character appraisal and management proposals (CAA) explains that the significance of the Conservation Area derives from its historic association with the early fishing community of Selsey which extended along the former East Road and Fish Lane, now East Street and Albion Road. The linear pattern of small cottages in tightly knit courtyard groups occupying shallow strips of land on either side of the road are important to its character. The many historic and traditional buildings and structures built in local materials, and the associated special features, including tide walls enclosing small front gardens, contribute positively to its appearance.
8. The roughly early C19 part hipped roofed Fisherman's Joy Public House is identified in the CAA as one of 2 public houses that are situated at or near each end of the Conservation Area. It now has a roughly L-shaped plan form and faces onto East Street and Manor Road close by, but its most historic part includes the easternmost 3 (first floor) light range facing East Street. The roughly early C19 2 storey dwelling at 77 East Street includes 2 gabled ranges parallel to East Street, and it is set back from the street by its modest front space, parts of which are bounded by low beach pebble walls. The scale, forms, siting, and architectural features of these listed buildings are important to their special architectural interest and to their significance as historic buildings.
9. Due to its scale and siting, little of the development can be glimpsed in narrow views from Manor Road and Gainsborough Drive. However, the upper part of its south west facing gable end can be seen from East Street above the boundary treatment at the back of the public house's garden and car park in the gap between the buildings at The Fisherman's Joy Public House and 77 East Street.
10. Historic maps in the CAA show that the plot of The Fisherman's Joy Public House was shallower in the late C19 than it is now, and along with other development in the Conservation Area including 77 East Street, it backed onto open fields in the surrounding countryside. The plot of The Fisherman's Joy Public House is now deeper, and the land behind 77 East Street now includes the buildings and grounds at 79 East Street. However, the openness in the

present grounds of The Fisherman's Joy Public House and at 79 East Street, preserves some of the historic open character of the former fields within their settings that contributes positively to the special interest and significance of the listed buildings.

11. The settings of heritage assets evolve over time, and much of the Conservation Area's surroundings have been developed. There are tiled, slate and thatched roofs within the Conservation Area that are important to its character and its appearance. However, the development is outside the Conservation Area, and the utilitarian character of the low profile sheet finished development respects the character of the similarly deep profile sheet roofed steelworks building beyond it. As the present roof is likely to look better and last longer than the previous roof, the restricted views of the development from some upper floor windows in nearby buildings within the Conservation Area should be enhanced. The development's eaves can barely be seen, and as their proportions are consistent with its scale and form, they are acceptable.
12. As the roof now slopes consistently in each direction, it is a little taller than the previous roof, which included lower pitched sections to each main slope. It is also a little larger due to the extended part that can barely be seen from its surroundings. However, as its form and detailed design are simpler, overall, the development has a neutral effect on the settings of the heritage assets.
13. Thus, I consider that the development does not harm the setting of the Conservation Area, and that the development preserves the settings of the listed buildings at The Fisherman's Joy Public House and 77 East Street. It satisfies LP Policy 33 which seeks a high standard of design and respect for the character of the area, and LP Policy 47 which aims to conserve the historic environment, and Framework chapter 16 which seeks to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Other Matter

14. The appellant has confirmed that the development is entirely for personal use as a swimming pool and recreational area, and the development's use was not a concern of the Council in its reason for refusal. I see no reason to disagree.

Conditions

15. The Council has suggested 3 conditions to deal with the implementation of the development, compliance with the approved plans, and for external materials. They have been considered in the light of Framework paragraph 56 and Planning Practice Guidance. As the development has been carried out, none of the suggested conditions are necessary, so they have not been imposed.

Conclusion

16. I have found that the development satisfies the Development Plan when taken as a whole. The other considerations in this case, including the Framework, do not indicate a determination otherwise.
17. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

J Reid

INSPECTOR