



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2024

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M3835/D/23/3328503

**Meadow Bank, 111 South Street, Tarring, Worthing, West Sussex
BN14 7ND**

- 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 Mrs Andrea Creighton against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
 - The application Ref AWDM/2009/22, dated 19 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is "First floor extension and new bi-folds to existing ground floor rear extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the West Tarring Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site includes the mainly 2-storey appeal dwelling, which is situated close to the pavement on the west side of South Street. The dwelling has been identified as a building of Local Interest. The roughly L-plan site is within the Conservation Area, the south boundary of which lies within Tarring Park beyond the low wall and drive to roughly south of the dwelling.
4. Whilst the dwelling's porch and main door face the pavement, the balanced composition of its south side, which includes two 2 storey rectangular balustrade topped bays and front facing gables, makes an important positive contribution to the character and appearance of the partly flint faced and render finished dwelling. The existing flat roofed extension to roughly west of the dwelling's south range is partly screened by the tall garden wall, which is broadly in line with the dwelling's south side. So, the historic form and character of the dwelling can be appreciated through and above the vegetation near the site's boundaries in views from the park and from South Street, including the part adjoining the park.
5. The Conservation Area is mainly characterised by its medieval street pattern, its historic mainly 2 storey buildings, and their relationships with the sinuous streets within the historic core of the village. The varied architectural forms and features of the historic buildings contribute positively to the Conservation Area's appearance, and to its significance as a historic settlement. Due to its

scale, siting, and its historic form and features, the appeal building makes a positive contribution to the character and the appearance of the Conservation Area.

6. The proposal includes a larger, potentially more thermally efficient, partly flat roofed single storey extension in place of that existing, a gable roofed upper floor extension, and alterations to the dwelling including a first floor window. The proposal would be set back a little from the dwelling's south façade, and its ridge and eaves would be lower than those of the dwelling's south range.
7. However, due to its scale, form and siting, the proposal would damage the dwelling's compact historic plan form and the important openness in its grounds, and it would detract from the balanced composition of the dwelling's prominent south side. The wide ground floor door opening would be poorly related to the extension's smaller upper floor, so along with its partly flat roofed form, the proposal would be incongruous. Moreover, the form and proportions of the west facing first floor 'picture' window would erode the dwelling's historic character. So, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and its significance as a locally important historic building, and that harm would be seen in the lengthy views across the park and from the nearby parts of South Street to roughly south. For the same reasons, the dwelling's positive contribution to the character, appearance and the significance of the Conservation Area would be harmfully diminished.
8. Tarring Manor care home was found acceptable on its merits, so it provides little support for this harmful scheme. As the proposal would be likely to endure long after the appellant's personal circumstances have ceased to be material, they would not outweigh the harm that the proposal would cause. Whilst the proposal would be partly screened by the garden wall and boundary treatments in the back garden, it would be seen by the occupiers and some of their visitors, and, in any event, the exercise of my statutory duty is not dependent on the ability of the public to access all of the Conservation Area. Conditions to control matters including tree protection and the proposal's junction with the garden wall would not make this unacceptable proposal acceptable.
9. The proposal would be within the wider setting of the Grade II listed building at Pendules, which lies to roughly north. As the listed building's wider setting would be expected to evolve to an extent over time, and having regard to the proposal's relationships with the listed building, its setting would be preserved.
10. However, in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area. All of the public benefits including jobs during construction would not outweigh the harm that the proposal would cause to the significance of the Conservation Area as a whole. Moreover, insufficient clear and convincing justification has been put to me to explain why the proposal would be necessary to conserve or enhance the character or appearance of the heritage asset, that is, the Conservation Area.
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 DM5 of the Worthing Borough Council Local Plan 2020-2036 (LP) which seeks high quality design and respect for context, LP Policy DM24 which reflects the thrust of my statutory duty regarding conservation areas, guidance in the Worthing Borough Council Supplementary Planning Guidance

Extending or altering your home, and 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