

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 5 September 2016

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 September 2016

Appeal A : APP/F1610/W/16/3150472

**Quarry Hill Cottage, The Quarry, Brockhampton, Cheltenham,
Gloucestershire GL54 5XL**

- 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 Mr Martin Haines against the decision of Cotswold District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00387/FUL, dated 1 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is strip stone tiles from cottage, re-tile front with stone tiles and rear with 'cardinal' reconstituted stone tiles.
-

Appeal B: APP/F1610/Y/16/3150474

**Quarry Hill Cottage, The Quarry, Brockhampton, Cheltenham,
Gloucestershire GL54 5XL**

- 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 Mr Martin Haines against the decision of Cotswold District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00388/LBC, dated 1 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2016.
 - The works proposed are strip stone tiles from cottage, re-tile front with stone tiles and rear with 'cardinal' reconstituted stone tiles.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A: The appeal is dismissed.
2. Appeal B: The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

3. Planning permission and listed building consent were originally sought for three separate elements, as set out in the application form: 1) Strip stone tiles from cottage, re-tile front with stone tiles and rear with 'cardinal' reconstituted stone tiles; 2) Replace 2 decayed front porches; 3) Replace window to stone store room on opposite side of road with double ½ glazed door.
 4. However, it is clear from all I have read that the appeal is being pursued only in respect of the reroofing of the property and is not in respect of the replacement of the porches or alterations to the outbuilding. I have, therefore, dealt with the appeal on the basis of the re-roofing only and have amended the description of the proposed development in the banner heading accordingly.
-

Main Issues

5. Quarry Hill Cottage is a Grade II listed building situated within the Brockhampton Conservation Area. Accordingly, the main issues in this case are the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and, linked to that, whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

6. The starting point for the consideration of the proposals is Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which require that special regard is had to the desirability of preserving the building, or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses. In terms of the Conservation Area, Section 72 (1) of the Act requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.
7. The special interest of Quarry Hill Cottage, which dates from the C17, lies in its age and its vernacular style which is enhanced by the use of traditional materials. The list description notes, amongst other things, that the building has an ashlar façade and a stone slate roof. These materials make a positive contribution to the significance of the listed building.
8. The proposal seeks to replace the stone slates on the rear roof slope with reconstituted stone tiles. The front roof slope would be re-roofed using natural materials.
9. I accept that modern artificial stone tiles attempt to replicate the appearance of natural stone slate but nevertheless they lack authenticity. In addition, I am unconvinced that they weather and age in the same way as natural stone. Moreover, the proposal would result in the loss of a key element of the building's historic fabric. As such the proposal would not preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the building or its significance.
10. I note from the appellant's statement that cost is the driving factor behind the proposal and that if the proposal is dismissed the appellant will not be able to afford to carry out the work and the roof will deteriorate further. However, there is no evidence before me to suggest that the difference in cost is significant or that the repair would be otherwise unviable. Furthermore, I have seen no evidence to show that the roof could not be repaired as part of the routine maintenance of the property. Lack of such maintenance does not justify the use of an inappropriate and harmful material.
11. I acknowledge that the rear roof slope is not readily visible from the street or any public footpath. However this has no bearing on the impact of the development on the integrity and special interest of the listed building. Heritage assets are a finite resource and the statutory requirement set out in the Act is a weighty material consideration. That requirement is reflected in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
12. Although there is some variation in external building materials in the vicinity of the site it seems to me that the predominance of stone built structures, and the presence of the listed building, contribute positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The replacement of a roof of natural materials with an artificial tile roof and its effect on the integrity of the listed

building, would neither preserve, much less enhance, the character or appearance of the conservation area.

13. Paragraph 134 of the Framework states that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, that harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case, whilst the harm to the significance of the heritage assets would be less than substantial, I am not aware of any public benefits that would outweigh the harm identified. Consequently the proposal would not meet the tests of the Framework in this respect.
14. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the proposed works would fail to preserve the special architectural interest of the listed building and for this reason the appeals do not succeed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR