

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 15 November 2016

by R Barrett BSc (Hons) MSc Dip UD Dip Hist Cons MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 5th December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/W/16/3154005

1, Woodbury Hollow Cottage, Woodbury Hill, Loughton Essex IG10 1JD

- 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 Jim Holloway against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref PL/EPF/3210/15, dated 15 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'the erection of a single storey rear extension-all new materials are to match existing'.
-

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/Y/16/3154010

1, Woodbury Hollow Cottage, Woodbury Hill, Loughton Essex IG10 1JD

- 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 Jim Holloway against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref PL/EPF/0026/16, dated 8 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'the erection of a single storey rear extension-all new materials are to match existing'.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

3. Appeal A and Appeal B relate to the same site. Whilst I have considered each proposal on its own merits, given that they are similar proposals, and in the interests of brevity, I have dealt with them in one document.

Main Issue

4. In both appeals, it is whether the proposed works and development would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of Woodbury Hollow Cottage; a grade II listed building.

Reasons

5. The appeal site includes a timber framed, two storey building with seventeenth century origins. It is a grade II listed building and a designated heritage asset. It has been extended in the past, by a simple cat slide rear addition and a two storey cross wing. Despite these additions, the appeal building has a compact,
-

simple, rectangular footprint and traditional form, with a generally solid appearance. These matters contribute to its significance as a heritage asset.

6. The appeal proposal would result in another addition to the listed building, which, even though small, would erode its existing compact form. It would extend beyond the existing rear elevation, resulting in a more complex footprint, which would fail to relate to the simple rectangular footprint of the host building. Even though the proposed glazed doors would be reused from the existing rear elevation, they would appear more prominent in an addition which would extend from that elevation. The proposed glazing, together with its form and the inclusion of a pitched roof, would fail to blend in with the more traditional form and solid appearance of the main dwelling. For all these reasons, it would detract from the significance of the listed building that I have identified.
7. I acknowledge that the appeal proposal would include materials to match, would reuse the existing glazed doors on the rear elevation and would not be visible from the front. However, these matters together, do not overcome my concern.
8. The appellant has pointed out that the appeal proposal would allow more light into the centre of the cottage and provide more living space. However, those benefits are restricted to existing and future occupiers only. Together, they do not outweigh the harm identified. I am also advised that the appellant has carried out sympathetic alteration and restoration to the appeal property in the past and the appeal applications are intended to overcome the concerns that the Council previously expressed. Whilst this is noted, it is not justification for further extension that would harm the significance of the listed building.
9. I conclude that the appeal proposal would fail to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of Woodbury Hollow Cottage. For this reason, it would be contrary to Policy HC10 of the Epping Forest District Council Local Plan (1998). That policy states that the Council will not give consent for works to the interior or exterior of a listed building which could detract from its historic interest or architectural character and appearance.

Public Benefits

10. In accordance with paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I accord great weight to the conservation of a designated heritage asset. I consider that the harm to the significance of the listed building would be less than substantial, a matter to which I attach considerable importance and weight. However, in this case, no public benefits, as identified in paragraph 134 of the Framework, are before me, which would outweigh that harm.

Other Matters

11. The appeal property is situated within the York Hill Conservation Area (CA). The CA is mainly comprised of an eclectic mix of domestic properties, set within spacious grounds, many of which are historic. It generally has a semi-rural, spacious and green character and appearance. The appeal property, its large grounds and simple, historic form, contributes to that character and appearance.

12. The Council has not raised concern regarding the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the CA. As the appeal proposal would be sited at the rear of the appeal property and would be open to limited public view, I have no reason to take an alternative view on this matter. The appeal proposal would therefore, on balance, preserve the character and appearance of the CA. However, this matter does not change the outcome of this appeal.
13. The appeal property is situated within the Green Belt (GB). The Council takes the view that the property has been extended to a large degree in the past and states that it would be difficult to class the appeal extension as limited given the existing extensions. However, I do not have sufficient information on which to assess whether the appeal extension would fall within the exceptions to inappropriate development in the GB set out in paragraph 89 of the Framework. If I had been minded to allow this appeal, I would have sought clarification on this matter. However, as this matter would not change the outcome of this appeal, I have no reason to consider it further.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, and taking all other matters raised into consideration, I conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

R Barrett

INSPECTOR