



Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 4 March 2025

Site visit made on 4 March 2025

by Mr Cullum Parker BA(Hons) PGCert MA FRGS MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/Y/24/3354700

(Former) Travis Perkins, The Causeway, Arundel, West Sussex BN18 9JL

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (PLBCAA) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Birchside Developments Ltd against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref LY/12/23/L, dated 4 December 2023, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2024.
 - The works proposed are *'A change of use and alterations to former Engine Shed (Listed Grade II) to provide 6 residential units.'*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for a change of use and alterations to former Engine Shed (Listed Grade II) to provide 6 residential units at (Former) Travis Perkins, The Causeway, Arundel, West Sussex BN18 9JL in accordance with the terms of the application Ref LY/12/23/L, dated 4 December 2023, subject to the conditions set out in Appendix A.

Procedural Matters

2. This decision associates to a planning decision made under appeal reference APP/C3810/W/24/3354570 for the same appeal site. The appeal here deals solely with the matter of works to the listed building, and the consents required for such works. The description of what has been granted here includes a change of use and the number of units proposed; the latter for which listed building consent is not a necessity. Its inclusion here is to provide clarity, with the listed building consent itself concerned with the proposed works to the listed building.
3. Prior to the Hearing taking place, the Local Planning Authority and Appellant submitted an agreed Statement of Common Ground. This indicates that subject to the acceptance of Drawing 22046 2.04 Revision D, which 'overcome' the comments from the Conservation Officer, this matter is no longer disputed between the main parties¹. At the Hearing, I determined that this Revision D drawing should be taken into account. Accordingly, the main parties confirmed that in such a scenario, the dispute between the parties in respect of the listed building consent appeal fell away.

¹ See Section 5 of the Agreed Statement of Common Ground. This agreement can also be found in the Local Planning Authority's Statement of Case, at page 6 of 8, paragraph 5.6 which states: *'For clarification the LPA have no objection to the works to the Listed Building should the amended plans be accepted (Rev D) by the Inspector.'*

4. Nonetheless, given the listed status of the Engine Shed building, there remains statutory duties for me to discharge in considering the works sought under the appeal scheme.

Application for costs

5. At the Hearing an application for full costs in respect of this listed building consent appeal was made by Birchside Developments Ltd against Arun District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether or not the proposed works would preserve the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Reasons

7. The appeal building is known as the Engine Shed, and is shown as 'Building A' on some of the drawings for the associated planning appeal². It is also referred to as the goods shed, albeit I have adopted the term Engine Shed as this how it is typically referred to by the main parties. The proposal seeks internal alterations and an extension to the Engine Shed in order to facilitate a new use as residential accommodation for six units. This is in association with a wider redevelopment of the entire appeal site.
8. The Engine Shed itself is a Grade II listed building dating from around 1863. The significance of the building, as identified by the Council's Conservation Officer and the Appellant's Heritage Impact Assessment (dated August 2023) derives from its evidential value in relation to the advent of the railway in the 19th Century and in particular the London, Brighton and South Coast Railway (LB&SCR) line. The design of its goods sheds are considered to exhibit a greater architectural quality than those of other lines. In particular here, is the fact that the building forms part of a culminating series of two storey goods sheds offering upper level space on this line, for which Arundel is the only extant example.
9. It is also possible to see a number of architectural features both within and outside of the listed building. For example, visitors to the building are able to see the contrast between the lack of openings (except for the lunette windows) on the station platform side of the building and the various timber door openings on the other three elevations. Of particular note are the lunette windows, which are an attractive feature set within brick arch surrounds. Internally is an open interior space. The significance of this heritage asset derives from both its architectural and historical interest.
10. Internally, the proposed works are shown on drawing 22046 2.03 Revision C – Proposed General Arrangements Building A. The proposal would subdivide the building into six residential units set over three floors. There would also be the addition of a three storey flat roof extension on the southern elevation of the building to provide a stairwell access and bin store. It is unfortunate the future visitors to the building would not be able to appreciate the vastness of the internal space, which would likely have been used for storage of goods in association with the adjacent railway line.

² Ref: APP/C3810/W/24/3354570

11. However, it appears from the submitted drawings that the internal changes to facilitate the creation of six residential units could be reversible in the future. This is because the outer walls of the building would essentially remain as they are now. In this respect, future generations will be able to see and appreciate the overall size of the building externally. Furthermore, the conversion of the building would bring it back into use, helping ensure that it is conserved for future generations whilst being adapted to the needs of current generations.
12. Externally the changes will see the insertion of casemate windows below the lunette windows in order to provide ventilation and light. There is reference on the drawings to double glazed window system being installed on drawing 22046 2.03 Revision C, for which further details of can be secured by condition to ensure that they, at worst, have a neutral impact on the listed building. Whilst there would be the introduction of new casemate windows, in most cases these seek to respect the architecture of the listed building by being inserted within the brick pilasters supporting the arches over the lunette windows.
13. The proposed three storey extension on the southern elevation of the building has been intentionally designed so as to appear subservient to the listed building. This is achieved through the use of different materials and finish on its elevations and its flat roof design. There is always a careful balance between preserving the listed building and potentially using a pastiche type of design, or being bold and using a contrasting architectural style, when adding extensions to listed buildings. In this case, the right balance appears to have been struck. This is because viewers of the building will clearly be able to see that the Engine Shed was formerly a building associated with the railways, that its residential use is part of its overall evolving story as a building, and that the extensions proposed to provide a stairwell and bin store are a reflection on society's current approach to adapting historic buildings built for one purpose and being re-used for alternate purposes. Their subservient and architecturally dissimilar form does not detract from the historic heart of the listed building and its features.
14. In terms of its setting, I concur with that suggested by the Council's Conservation Officer, where the setting includes the appeal site, and also the railway station (and car park), platforms and the railway line itself. All of these can be seen from the appeal site. Moreover, given the proximity of the building to the railway station and line, people are able to appreciate kinetic, aural, and visual relationships in the setting arising from train movements on the railway line and public announcements and the Engine Shed listed building. These aspects of the listed building's setting will remain unaffected by the proposed works.
15. Accordingly, in exercising the duties under s16(2) of the PLBCAA, I find that the proposed works would preserve the building, its setting and features of special architectural and historic interest it possess.
16. As such, it would accord with Policies HER SP1 and HER DM1 of the LP which, amongst other aims, seek to ensure that listed buildings and their settings are conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance. For similar reasons, and giving great weight to the asset's conservation, the proposal would accord with the Policies set out in the Framework at Section 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

17. With regard to the term 'enabling development', this is referred to in Paragraph 221 of the Framework. However, it was made clear at the Hearing by the Appellant that they were not relying upon the development being required in order to secure the future conservation of a heritage asset where it departs from the development plan policies. I have not found harm in respect of the proposed works. But to be clear, I have dealt with the application not as 'enabling development' within the typical understanding of the operation of Paragraph 221 of the Framework if that is of relevance in this case in respect of listed building consent.

Conditions

18. The Council has only suggested one condition relating to details of windows and doors. However I have imposed more for the following reasons:
19. A condition requiring the works to be carried out in accordance with submitted drawings is necessary in this case, as there have been amendments to the drawings since the application was first made. This condition would provide clarity.
20. A condition requiring the submission of details of materials to be used is necessary and reasonable in order to protect the listed building. It would also provide precision and certainty as to the final finishes of the listed building and any extensions to it.
21. For similar reasons, conditions requiring details of the doors and windows (including scaled drawings), details of the any attachments, finishes and the making good of these and any damage to the listed building arising from the implementation of the proposed works, are necessary and reasonable in order to protect the listed building.

Conclusion

22. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

C Parker

INSPECTOR

Appendix A - List of conditions imposed

- 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
- 2) The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
22046 2.01 B - Location and Block Plan, and;
22046 2.04 D - Building A Proposed Elevations, and;
22046 2.03C - Building A Proposed General Arrangements, and;
22046 2.19 – Typical Section Through Engine Shed.
- 3) No works shall commence until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the internal and external surfaces of the works hereby consented have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.
- 4) Prior to their insertion details of the windows and doors including their design and/or appearance (including elevation), specification, glazing bars, glazing (system), method of opening, decorative/protective finish (for example stain or paint and colour) and location within the reveal, in the form of drawings and sections of an appropriate scale, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter they shall be installed and retained as approved.
- 5) No works shall commence until details of all new internal works, including any attachment, finishes, and/or works of making good to the retained historic fabric of the listed building, is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be implemented as approved.
- 6) Upon completion of the works authorised by this consent, any damage caused to the building in the course of carrying out the works shall be made good within six months in accordance with a scheme submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

**** END OF CONDITIONS ****

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Scott Stemp

Counsel, instructed by Susan Leeson

Susan Leeson, BSc(Hons) M.Phil (TP)

Planning Consultant

Mark Nicholls

Appellant, Birchside Development Ltd

Euan Clark, BA(HHons) BArch MA RIBA ARB

Architect

Phil Russell, ONC HNC CIHT

Transport Consultant

Mark Sanderson, BA (Hons) MA IHBC

Heritage Consultant

Keith Miller, BA (Hons), MALA, CMLI

Landscape Consultant

Michael Duff, Beng(Hons) CEng MICE

Drainage Consultant

Peter Griffiths, CIHCM Level 4 Diploma Housing

Viability Consultant

Richard Moores, MNAEA

Land and Marketing Consultant

Anita Gardner, BSc (Hons) BTP

Smith Simmons & Partners

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Amber Willard, MRTPI

Principal Planning Officer

Simon Davis

Principal Planning Officer

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Two members of the public attended the Hearing to observe proceedings.