



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2025

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/25/3368415

Kingston Manor, Kingston Lane, Kingston, West Sussex, BN16 1RR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Richard Andrew against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref is K/5/25/HH.
 - The development proposed is an agricultural equipment store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an agricultural equipment store at Kingston Manor, Kingston Lane, Kingston, West Sussex, BN16 1RR in accordance with the terms of the application Ref K/5/25/HH, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: 04-03-25 - LB-01, EX-01, PL-01, PL-02 and PL-03.

Main Issue

2. Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses.
3. Accordingly, I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the setting of Kingston Manor listed grade II and associated curtilage listed buildings.

Reasons

4. The principal listed building is Kingston Manor, an early C19, two-storey with attic house, listed Grade II. Also of significance are other historic structures to the east of the main house, including a cottage and a chapel. There is also a group of former farm buildings and a more recent 'L' shaped single storey structure and swimming a pool.

5. The appellant proposes the construction of an agricultural store building located to the east of the group of former farm building and separated from them by an existing courtyard.
6. It would be located in a part of the grounds currently utilised to store building materials etc and generally less formal than the area surrounding the main house. The site, which is very different in character to that to the west, is well screened by a mature hedge and trees. As I observed there are only very limited views of the manor house and other curtilage listed buildings from the proposed site of the building. This is due to the intervening buildings and mature tree planting to the west of the appeal site.
7. The building would have a footprint of 6.0 metres x 15.5 metres. The single storey structure would have a slate covered gabled roof, the ridge height of which would be about 5.0 metres.
8. I appreciate that there was an earlier similar proposal for a car barn Planning Ref: K/5/17/HH dismissed at appeal Ref: APP/C3810/W/17/3175616 on this site. However, as well as being significantly larger, that barn was to be positioned at 90 degrees to the current proposal and would have projected well into the open land beyond the manor house and the curtilage buildings. It would thereby have been significantly more prominent than that proposed.
9. The Council found that the building would not be unduly prominent and thereby would not cause harm to the character of the wider area. From what I have seen and read I have not formed a contrary view.
10. The proposed building would be clad externally with weatherboarding above a brick plinth with a slate roof, reflecting its use and status. In addition to a personnel door in the southern elevation there would be five pairs of doors facing east. The building would match the design style, form and appearance of the building more recent built adjacent to the swimming pool and the slate roof would also be in keeping with that of the former farm buildings. Given its size form and palette of external materials selected it would, despite its size appear as a typical subservient agricultural building.
11. In conclusion, the proposed store building would not cause harm to the setting of the listed house, or the curtilage listed buildings. The development would therefore accord with the objectives of National Planning Policy Framework and the Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 (Adopted July 2018) and the as they relate to, along with other things, the quality of development and the preservation of the setting of listed buildings.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in light of the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In the interests of precision and enforceability, I have amended the Council's suggested wording where appropriate.
13. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building are clearly annotated on the design drawings and set out on the application form. Accordingly, I do not consider that the Council's suggested condition in respect of material is either appropriate or necessary in this case.

14. In the interests of certainty, I shall however impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusion

15. Accordingly, for the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR