



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2022

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P1425/D/21/3286080

14 The Green, Newick BN8 4LB

- 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 Tim Wonnacott against the decision of Lewes District Council.
 - The application Ref LW/21/0515, dated 25 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2021.
 - The development is Proposed conversion of out-building to ancillary accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. The application plans showing the 'existing' dwelling include front and rear roof extensions to the appeal dwelling that have not been built. There is no reference to them in the description of proposed works given on the application form, the design and access, heritage and planning statement, the grounds of appeal, or in the officer's report. As there is almost nothing to suggest that these proposed extensions to the appeal dwelling are part of the appeal proposal, I shall not consider them.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is within the Newick (The Green) Conservation Area. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
4. The Conservation Area includes historic development along the gently curving A272 through the north part of the village. The appeal site is in the east part of the Conservation Area, where the main road crosses the roughly triangular Green. This part of the Conservation Area is mainly characterised by the openness at the Green, the mostly 2 storey listed buildings that partly frame it, the partial sylvan backdrop, and views of its countryside setting to roughly north east. The form and styles of the historic buildings, largely sympathetic later infill, and use of a range of building materials, are important to its appearance. These features contribute positively to the significance of the Conservation Area as an important part of the historic rural settlement.
5. The existing 2 storey pitched roofed appeal dwelling is on the south west side of the Green and set away from the building at number 16 by its drive. As the site is wider at the back than at the front, the existing pitched roofed single storey outbuilding (with an upper floor within part of its roof space), by its

south east boundary, is broadly in line with, and attached to, a slightly lower pitched roofed rear outshoot at number 16.

6. Number 16 is part of a row of listed buildings including 16, 18 and 20 The Green, the Bull Inn, and Atlantis and Algiers, which are included on the statutory list for their group value. The group makes a significant positive contribution to the Conservation Area, edging much of the south west side of the Green. The appeal dwelling was built around the mid-1960s. Its simple form, plain roof slopes, and use of materials are sympathetic to the nearby listed buildings. Moreover, due to its scale, width, siting, simple roof form and low-key character, the good-sized outbuilding is subservient to the appeal dwelling, and it respects the setting of the listed building at 16, 18 and 20 The Green.
7. The proposal would include a study and games room on the ground floor and a bedroom and bathroom in the upper floor. The footprint of the outbuilding and its ridge and eaves heights would not change. The proposal would include a windowless tile hung gabled dormer in the south east roof slope and 2 gabled dormer windows in the north west roof slope, which would be as tall as its ridge and nearly as deep as its eaves, as well as a tall flue, and a tall first floor glazed opening and Juliette balcony in its gable end.
8. Due to the bulk, scale, and siting of the dormers and the domestic appearance of the first floor glazing and rooftop features, the proposal would unacceptably erode the subservient character and utilitarian appearance of the outbuilding. Because the outbuilding's roof would look built-up and cluttered, it would be harmfully at odds with the largely uninterrupted roof slopes that are important to the character and appearance of most nearby buildings, and it would fail to preserve the setting of the listed building at 16, 18 and 20 The Green.
9. The proposal would be seen above the tall gates in the gap between the appeal dwelling and number 16 from the Green, which includes views from around the village store and the nearby roads, in filtered views through the intervening vegetation at the back, including the car park of the nearby Bull public house, and from the grounds of some nearby dwellings. As there is little information about the planning circumstances of the first floor extension at number 16, it provides little support for this damaging scheme.
10. In terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) the proposal would cause 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of the Conservation Area. However, the public benefits, including keeping the outbuilding in active use, would not be enough to outweigh that less than substantial harm. Moreover, insufficient clear and convincing justification has been put to me to show that the proposal would be necessary to conserve or enhance the significance of the heritage asset.
11. Therefore, I consider that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. It would be contrary to Policy CP11 of the Lewes District Local Plan Part 1 Joint Core Strategy and Policy DM25 of the Lewes District Local Plan Part 2 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (LP) which seek high quality design and respect for context, LP Policy DM29 which aims for the scale and design of ancillary buildings to relate satisfactorily to the existing dwelling, and Policy EN1 of the Newick Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan which seeks respect for the Conservation Area. It would also be contrary to the Framework

which aims for heritage assets to be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

Conclusion

12. I have found that the proposed development would be contrary to the Development Plan when taken as a whole. The other considerations in this case, including the Framework, do not outweigh that conflict.
13. For the reasons given, the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reid

INSPECTOR