Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1767/17 and AWDM/1017/18 **Recommendation – APPROVE**

Site: **Yew Tree House, West Street, Sompting, BN15 0BE**

Proposal: **1) Retrospective application for demolition and rebuilding outbuilding.**
2)Retrospective application for Listed Building Consent for demolition and reconstruction of outbuilding.

Date of site visit: 04.01.2018

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

Yew Tree House (formerly Farmhouse) is a late 18th century, Grade II Listed Building first listed in March 1976.

The principal elevation is a Roman Render finish, however it has flint boundary walls and flint outbuildings. The outbuilding to which this application relates, is forward or the house, and at an angle from it. It also abuts the former vegetable garden (which is being brought back into use).

The locality is generally much more recent than the application house, with housing estates opposite and behind. A recreation ground is opposite the site.

This report covers both the planning and listed building applications.

Relevant Planning History: None

Consultations: The Council's **Design and Conservation Architect** has made the following comments:

1. There will be a need to submit a Listed Building Consent application as the previous Listed Building curtilage outbuilding structure was demolished, and was deemed part of the special interest of the Listed Building.

2. The new structure appears to occupy a slightly, but potentially significant, different position. A metal curved topped gate previously occupied a gap in the flint wall between the garden area and the gravelled driveway. This gap has noticeably grown as the southern face of the new structure has been located further away from the road. It would also appear that the new structure sits into the gravel driveway area. The old wall with the metal gated entrance appears to have been continuous

and therefore aligned. The area of planting on the gravel side of the old wall/structure has been removed thus allowing this reconfigure.

3. The brick quoining is over-scaled for such a small building, drawing attention to the heavy corners of the building The quoining size varies on different corner elevations and even the quoining either side of the door changes. The converted outbuilding used as a residence at the end of the driveway uses much lighter quoins on openings and corners. Also note the drawings do not show the brickwork accurately.

4. The window. The application form indicates a window in the old structure. No images can be found of this. The new window opening has boarding over so the actual window used cannot be seen. The drawing does not detail this window; therefore drawings of the window are required.

5. The door. Although the door is timber, it looks like a residential door. It is not the simple close boarded type you would expect in an outbuilding.

Despite each of these issues not being highly important in themselves, they need to be considered as a package.

Subsequent comments: The last outstanding issue that I can recall were the oversized quoins, which at one point the applicant had offered to rebuild. Subsequently the applicant changed his mind and applied to install trellis over them and grow plants (presumably evergreen) up them. This obviously wasn't right architecturally, but at the end of the day a planner must decide if on balance the works are acceptable, remembering this was a curtilage listed building.

Representations: Sompting Parish Council:
Customer made comments in Support of the planning application.

2 Letters of support from :- 9 Malthouse Close, Sompting; and Yew Tree House Annexe, West Street, Sompting

- We look directly onto the courtyard/driveway where the building is situated;
- I would confirm our support of the application as the building has been finished sympathetically to the main house and the flint wall of which this is part of;
- It is not too high as to overlook or obscure light to our property;
- It looks as if it has always been there;
- One wall of the original building had collapsed and the remaining walls were close to following;
- The roof had been replaced in the past with one totally out of keeping with the age of the building;
- The rebuild has restored the building to the look it had when new, and now blends in with the rest of the buildings in the curtilage, including the annexe

Relevant Planning Policies
Adur Local Plan 2017: Policy 15, 17
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

The key issues are the effect on the listed building as well as the residential and visual amenities of the locality, together with the character of the area.

Visual Amenity

The main house is a Listed Building. The building, the subject of this application is a curtilage building, which means that the listing of a building affords protection to those objects or structures contained within its curtilage which form part of the land and have done so since before 1 October 1973.

The outbuilding was a slight mono pitch roof structure, and is likely a vernacular building as it and other outbuildings are of flint construction. It would appear that the outbuilding had not been properly maintained over the years and the flints needed attention and the building had partially collapsed, further the roof of the outbuilding was of asbestos, and thereby needed to be totally removed.

The owners thereby demolished the outbuilding and saved the flints in order to re-build it on the same footprint and of the same dimensions.

They did though not put the roof back on as it was, i.e. slight slope, but instead built a hipped roof and covered it in slate tiles.

Photos attached with the application visibly show the sorry state of the outbuilding, and it is clear why it had to be taken down in order to repair it.

The main house has a gable end roof with a gable end side extension, and that extension has a full hipped extension. The annex to the rear also has a hipped roof. Therefore the new hipped roof of the outbuilding does not affect the setting of the listed building or the character of the locality. The choice of slates also reflects the roof covering on the main house.

The Council's Design and Conservation Architect had expressed concern at some aspects of the works but these have largely been satisfactorily explained and justified by the applicant in a supporting statement. The last outstanding issue that he has is with the oversized quoins. The applicant is proposing to install trellis over them and grow plants to hide the heavy appearance of the quoins. The Conservation Architect is not entirely supportive of this solution in architectural terms but it is considered to be an acceptable proposal in the circumstances as the harm caused is not considered to be such as to warrant refusal.

The building is not considered to cause harm to the setting of the listed building or the wider area and, on balance, the applications can be supported.

Residential Amenity

Because of its locations, some 10m distant from the closest residential property, the reconstruction of the outbuilding with a hipped roof will not result in a loss of residential amenity to that property, other residential properties are further away, and the outbuilding is unlikely to be readily viewed from those properties

Recommendation

APPROVE AWDM/1767/17 and AWDM/1017/18 subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved plans

Informative

1. Approved without amendment

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 05.12.2018

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 10 December 2018