
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2016

by Kenneth Stone BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/D2510/Y/16/3145160

Honeysuckle Cottage, Lush's Bridge, Frithville, Boston, Lincolnshire PE22 7DN

- 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 Paul and Anne Robinson against the decision of East Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref S/054/01180/15, dated 17 June 2015, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2015.
 - The works proposed are extension and alterations to existing cottage to provide a shower room/entrance to include external cladding and re-roofing, and the re-roofing of the existing cottage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for extension and alterations to existing cottage to provide a shower room/entrance to include external cladding and re-roofing, and the re-roofing of the existing cottage at Honeysuckle Cottage, Lush's Bridge, Frithville, Boston, Lincolnshire PE22 7DN in accordance with the terms of the application Ref S/054/01180/15, dated 17 June 2015 and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural matters

2. The application is retrospective and seeks listed building consent for various extension and works to the listed cottage. These works have already been undertaken and were in place at the time of my site visit.
3. The Council's statement of case draws attention to section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, however, that refers to when considering the grant of planning permission, this is an application for Listed Building consent. The operative section of the Act would be sec 16(2) which is similar in provision, and requires that the decision maker in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works shall have regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possess. I have done so in this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the works on the setting of the listed building or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
-

Reasons

5. In general the application seeks consent for the re-roofing of the original cottage, the rendering of two outbuildings, one of which appears to have been extended, and the provision of a flat roof to one of the outbuildings.
6. The cottage is one of a pair of 18th century brick cottages with a tiled roof. The building derives its significance from the architectural and historical evidential value of the building including the materials and building details.
7. It is unclear when the cottage the subject of the appeal was re-roofed and I have no detail that confirms this. It is apparent that it has been re-roofed and the existing tiles are concrete tiles. The other half of this pair of cottages has also evidently been re-roofed albeit with clay tiles. In terms of the size, form shape and profile the pantiles used on both properties are not easily distinguishable and I disagree with the Council that they appear thicker and heavier on the appeal property than those on the adjoining cottage. There is a slight difference in colour and patina but this is potentially likely due to age as much as material. The re-roofing has not altered the scale, shape or form of the building, has used a tile that is closely matched in appearance to that on the adjacent property and there is no evidence before me as to what the original roof covering may have been or when this alteration actually took place.
8. Whilst the loss of historic fabric can be concerning it is evident that both properties have lost their original roof coverings some time ago, and it is not clear if this was before the properties were listed; the listing is unclear on this. In these circumstances it is not clear that historic fabric has been recently lost or compromised and therefore this is not a significant contributor to the significance of the listed building.
9. The chosen roof covering is similar to that adjoining, in character and appearance, and is in-keeping with the appearance of the cottage. On this basis I conclude that the re-roofing of the main cottage is acceptable and does preserve the special architectural and historic interest the cottage possess.
10. Turning to the alterations and extensions that affect the latter additions to the cottage. These are alterations to 20th century alterations and additions; they do not directly affect the main cottage which holds the significance of the listed building. The alterations to render the external walls provide differentiation to the more modern additions and ensure that there is no confusion or obscuring of the original scale, mass, shape and form of the architectural composition of the original cottage. The additions are ones that had previously been made and are of a scale, size and shape, that ensure they are ancillary elements to the cottage and do not obscure its original form or dimensions, even if they have been slightly increased in size. Whilst the flat roof element is an alteration to a modern addition, and draws attention to it, it is a small element of the whole and only affects the modern addition; it does not therefore affect the architectural or historic interest of the main cottage. In this regard these works do not affect the historic or architectural interest of the cottage or its setting.
11. The appellant refers to the poor condition of these parts of the building before the works were undertaken but I have no firm evidence of this, although the

Council do not dispute these comments. I give this matter some weight, but limited by the lack of direct evidence.

12. The alterations make the cottage more habitable making provision for normal sanitary accommodation and make the viable use of the property more secure. This is a benefit to the works.
13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the works do not materially harm the architectural or historic interest of the building or its setting and indeed preserve those matters, and I have had special regard to this.

Conclusions

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should succeed. Given that the application is retrospective for the retention of works there are no conditions required to be imposed.

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR