
Appeal Decisions

Hearing held on 29 September 2016

Site visit made on 29 September 2016

by Jacqueline Wilkinson Reg. Architect IHBC

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

Decision date: 02 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/W/16/3151379

Garden Cottage, Penruddocke Arms, Hindon Road, Dinton, Salisbury, SP3 5EL

- 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 John Ring against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 15/06643/FUL, dated 24 July 2015, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is to extend a curtilage listed building (extend and form a kitchen and additional bedrooms).
-

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940 /Y/16/3151381

Garden Cottage, Penruddocke Arms, Hindon Road, Dinton, Salisbury, SP3 5EL

- 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 John Ring against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 15/02806/LBC, dated 24 July 2015, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2016.
 - The works proposed are to extend a curtilage listed building (extend and form a kitchen and additional bedrooms).
-

Preliminary matters

1. A significant amount of construction has taken place which differs from the submitted plans in a number of ways and a number of fences, gates and sheds have been erected at the appeal site. The rubble stone wall (the west elevation of the appeal building) has been substantially rebuilt/altered. These are all matters for the Council and I have not taken them into account when assessing these appeals.
2. For the avoidance of doubt, I have assessed these appeals with reference to the submitted plans as I am required to do and I have referred to them as the as the proposed plans.

Decision

3. The appeals are dismissed.
-

Main Issues

4. The appellant makes the case that the appeal building does not fall into the definition of a curtilage listed building set out in above Act¹. However, an outbuilding is shown on 1939 Ordnance Survey map approximately in the position of the current building. Its original function is likely to have been a piggery, as indicated by the small walled yards facing south. The 1978 map shows that it was altered by then to a horticultural use, as indicated by the glazed area over the yards. It was then later converted to staff accommodation. Photographs show that this clearly involved significant rebuilding and alteration, but as the building was there in 1948, it was reasonable for the Council to take the view that it was listed by virtue of its curtilage connection with the principal listed building. However, reasonable evidence was submitted to demonstrate that the alterations to convert it to accommodation took place before the date of listing (December 1986).
5. In its heavily altered form the historic interest of the staff accommodation building was solely due to the coursed rubble stonework in the west wall, which was the only part of this building which was there in 1948. This section of wall therefore remained within the definition of a curtilage listed structure. The Council did not object to the proposed alterations to the wall as shown on the submitted plans. Due to the isolated and altered context of this wall the proposed works to it would not harm the setting or significance of the principal listed building.
6. I have assessed the main issues in these appeals on the basis of advice given by Historic England², which is that "curtilage structures should be considered in proportion to their significance". Given the very limited significance of the appeal building, I have identified the main issues as i) whether the proposed alterations and extensions would preserve the setting, and therefore significance of the principal listed building and ii) the effect of the proposal on the natural beauty and character of the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Reasons

Setting of listed building

7. The Penruddocke Arms is a Grade 2 listed early nineteenth century roadside inn. As would be expected, its main and more formal façade faces the road, with a distinctive wide double canted bay. The rear elevation is dominated by a large two storey late 19th century wing, with former stabling entered from the west side. Two other outbuildings were shown on the 1939 map, but they had gone by 1978. By contrast to the formal front, this rear setting is an informal area, reflecting its service role to the roadside inn. The lost outbuildings were small and would have been relatively unobtrusive in the wider setting of the inn. The quality of this setting has suffered over time due to an unattractive flat roofed rear extension and the unsympathetic 20th century side extensions, as well as the use of suburban timber fencing. The former staff building (the appeal building as it was), was of distinctly poor architectural quality.
8. The primary setting for the listed inn is its roadside approaches from both directions. There is sporadic development here and there along the road, and

¹ Section 1(5) (b)

² Section 15 Managing Significance in Decision –Taking in the Historic Environment. 2015

there are two dwellings to the west, although these are well set back and are low. Nevertheless, the listed inn still retains its wider open landscape setting, giving it a sense of its relative isolation. This is especially apparent in views looking towards the appeal building across the open car park. This openness is important because it contributes to its historic significance of the building as a country roadside inn. The informal setting at the rear is not the main setting for the listed building but nevertheless the descending hierarchy of extensions and buildings makes a contribution to the understanding of how the roadside inn functioned in the past.

9. It is proposed to increase the accommodation of the appeal building by extending it to the south and adding a pitched roof with two rooms and a bathroom. To achieve this level of accommodation in the roof, the existing walls are proposed to be raised by a considerable amount and the footprint would be increased by approximately one third.
10. Both the ridge and the eaves line of the proposed roof extension would be higher than the adjacent 19th century rear wing of the principal building. Although it is to the rear of the main building, the proposed roof and the upper part of the side elevation would be seen clearly from the semi-public large car park and from the beer garden and children's' play area, all of which constitute the open landscape setting to the pub. When seen from these areas the high and long roof of the proposed building would be at odds with the descending rooflines of the existing outbuildings. It would impinge significantly on the wider open landscape setting around the listed inn.
11. The appellant makes the case that the proposal would be an improvement over the former staff block. However, the extension of the eaves well beyond the walls would fail to disguise scale of the proposed building and this wide eaves overhang would look odd. The large section of wall over the window heads would give it awkward proportions, which can be seen on the submitted cross-section. Its overall design would not relate to any traditional building type or construction in the area. The proposed roof tiles and roof lights would be traditional in character, but this would not overcome the excessive height and length and poor design quality of the proposed building. Whilst the existing building was no thing of beauty, it was small and low. The proposed building would not only be of poor design quality but it would also be significantly higher and longer. I note the applicant is willing to substitute timber windows for the PVCu windows, but this would not overcome the fundamental issue of the scale and height of the proposed building.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposed building would fail to preserve the setting or significance of the listed building as required by Sections 16 and 66 of the Act and Wiltshire Core Strategy 2015, policy 58 *Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment*.

Area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB)

13. Policy 51 *Landscape* of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, 2015, requires that development should protect, conserve and where possible enhance landscape character and in the case of AONBs it should take into account the objectives, policies and actions in the relevant management plans. The Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB Management Plan explains that whilst the protection of the area's natural beauty is its primary purpose, amongst its

other community priorities is the conservation of the historic, archaeological and cultural features within the area.

14. The Penruddocke Arms is one of a number of historic roadside and village pubs in this part of the AONB. Its significance is partly due to its relatively open and isolated location, which clearly distinguishes it as an roadside inn. Whilst the previous appearance of the appeal building was unsympathetic to its historic setting, the proposed building would be much higher and longer and as I have explained above, its design would not refer to any local building tradition. This would harm the wider landscape setting of the heritage asset, contrary to the aims of the AONB Management Plan. The proposal would therefore fail the requirements of Core policy 57.

Conclusions

15. I have concluded that the proposed building, due to its height and scale, would harm the setting and therefore the significance of the principal listed building and it would also harm the wider open landscape setting of the listed building, which would be in conflict with the aims of the AONB Management Plan to conserve the natural and cultural landscape character of the area.
16. I am required by paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework to weigh this harm against any public benefits of the proposal. For the reasons I have set out above, I am not persuaded by the appellant's suggestion that the proposal would lead to an improvement over the existing building. Whilst timber windows would improve its appearance, this would not overcome the fundamental matters of its excessive height and scale. The provision of a larger dwelling would improve the amenity of the occupiers, but a different design approach would be just as likely to be adequate in terms of amenity, so I do not give this weight as a public benefit.
17. I note the petition of signatures and local support. However, these do not persuade me that the appeal should be upheld, particularly as the dwelling could be improved and extended using other design approaches which would not have the harmful effects I have identified.
18. I therefore conclude that there would be no public benefits to outweigh the harm I have identified to the principal listed building. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeals should fail.

Jacqueline Wilkinson

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Andy Partridge	Southern Planning Practice Ltd
Bob Edwards	Forum Heritage
William Penny	Architect
Mr and Mrs Ring	

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Lucy Minting	Senior Planning Officer
Andrew Minting	Conservation Officer

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Allan Bennie	Dinton Parish Council
Mark Allen	Local Resident
Matthew Legge	Observing

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Council: AONB Character Assessment for Vale of Wardour
- 2 Appellant: undated petition of 54 signatures.
- 3 Statement of common ground dated 26 September 2016.