



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 2 October 2023

by A Parkin BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th October 2023

Appeal A Ref: APP/C1435/W/23/3314939

22 Church Street, Willingdon, East Sussex BN20 9HR

- 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 K Ratcliffe against the decision of Wealden District Council.
 - The application Ref WD/2022/2217/F, dated 23 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is replacement of existing upvc double glazed door with heritage aluminium door.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/C1435/Y/23/3314933

22 Church Street, Willingdon, East Sussex BN20 9HR

- 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 K Ratcliffe against the decision of Wealden District Council.
 - The application Ref WD/2022/2218/LB, dated 23 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 November 2022.
 - The works proposed are replacement of existing upvc double glazed door with heritage aluminium door.
-

Appeal A: Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B: Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As set out above there are two appeals on this site. Appeal A concerns the refusal of planning permission and Appeal B concerns the refusal of listed building consent, although in both cases, the appeal site and the works proposed are the same. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits and with regard to the relevant legislation, policy and guidance. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposed works would preserve a Grade II listed building.

Reasons

5. The appeal building, St. Wilfred's, 22 Church Street¹, is a Grade II listed building in the Parish of Willingdon and Jevington. It is a two-storey building

¹ List Entry Number 1028502. The building is also referred to as *Coombe House* by the appellant in their evidence.

currently used as a dwellinghouse, with the front part said to date from the 18th Century, with an older building likely to the rear. In my view, the significance of this designated heritage asset stems from its location, design, including incremental changes over several hundred years, and its largely vernacular materials.

6. The tiled roof contains two hipped dormer windows at the front, whilst at the rear, there is a tiled catslide roof, exposed brickwork and flint walls, with further hipped dormers and extensions. There are two partly glazed timber doorways at ground level and first floor level at the rear, together with a considerable variety of window sizes and designs, including timber sash and casement windows, metal-latticed timber windows, as well as metal framed/latticed windows, described as 'Crittall' in the evidence.
7. The appeal concerns a somewhat over-sized doorway in a rear, single-storey, hipped-roof extension at the southwestern corner of the building. The doorway opens onto the rear garden of the dwelling and is occupied by a predominantly glazed, white upvc door and frame, which the appellant accepts is unauthorised.
8. There are three, single-glazed, timber framed windows, some containing glazing bars, on the southern and western elevations of the extension. These are not dissimilar to some of the timber windows on the rear of the main building.
9. The extension containing the appeal doorway has a shallower roof pitch than the outrigger of the main building to which it is attached, and the roof is constructed of slates rather than tiles.
10. Nevertheless, it shares common eastern and western elevational planes with the main building/outrigger. Furthermore, the stucco on the western elevation of the building also includes the extension, whilst the southern and eastern elevations of the extension comprise flint walls with brick details, similar to the adjacent outrigger. Whilst the extension is a distinct feature, these aspects provide some coherence with the main building.
11. The age of the rear extension is unclear from the evidence. A conveyance plan said to be from 1901 shows an extension at the southwestern corner of the building, whilst a later plan, dated 1934, shows a similar extension. Whilst there may have been subsequent works to the extension, these are not clear from the evidence and it is likely that the extension was constructed at least as early as the 19th century.
12. However, the design of the proposed door seems largely predicated on the extension dating from the 1950s. I am not satisfied this is the case. Furthermore, I do not find the design or materials of the proposed door would relate well to the extension, including the fenestration and the cast iron water pump nearby, or to other windows and doorways at the rear of the building. The 'Crittall' windows elsewhere on the building that are referenced by the appellant are of a completely different latticed design to the proposed door. On that overall basis, the door would be an alien insertion that would not relate at all well to the listed building.
13. I note the appellant's comments regarding the poor environmental performance of the existing timber doors, or a 'Crittall' door compared to the

proposed door. However, I also note that the windows in the extension are single glazed, with a consequently poor thermal performance. Furthermore, other designs for the doorway, with potentially good thermal performance and more in keeping with the extension or the rear of the building, have not been considered.

14. Improved insulation of a building to reduce carbon emissions would be a public benefit of the proposal, although the limited scale of any carbon reductions means this would carry negligible weight in this case.
15. Consequently, the proposed works would cause less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset and the very limited public benefits would not outweigh this harm.
16. For these reasons, the proposed works would fail to preserve a Grade II listed building. They would, in so far as relevant, conflict with Policy SPO2 of the Wealden District Local Plan Core Strategy 2013, which concerns the protection of the historic environment, and with the National Planning Policy Framework 2023, in this regard.

Other Matters

17. In the evidence there are references to other heritage assets nearby, including the Grade I listed building, *The Hoo*, as well as the Willingdon - Church Street Conservation Area. Were I not dismissing this appeal for the reasons set out above, I would have sought further information regarding the effect of the proposal on the significance of other designated heritage assets.
18. The appellant's references to an eastern extension to the building, constructed prior to 1934, do not cause me to reach a different conclusion with regard to the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, I conclude that Appeal A and Appeal B are dismissed.

Andrew Parkin

INSPECTOR