
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 17 November 2016

by Jane Miles BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 December 2016

Appeal A: APP/Y3940/W/16/3154958

Baydon House, Aldbourne Road, Baydon, Wiltshire SN8 2JB

- 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 & Mrs M Lloyd against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application ref: 16/02183/FUL, dated 3 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing glass house, and the erection of ground floor extension, the re-organisation of internal room layout, and associated external alterations.
-

Appeal B: APP/Y3940/Y/16/3154959

Baydon House, Aldbourne Road, Baydon, Wiltshire SN8 2JB

- 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 & Mrs M Lloyd against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application ref: 16/02309/LBC, dated 3 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2016.
 - The works proposed are demolition of existing glass house, and the erection of ground floor extension, the re-organisation of internal room layout, and associated external alterations.
-

Decision

1. Appeals A and B are both dismissed.

Reasons

2. The appeal scheme follows previous schemes for more extensive proposals. The Council raises no objection to the various internal alterations included in this current scheme, or to the demolition of the existing glazed conservatory structure at the rear of the grade II listed building. I find no grounds to conclude that any of those works would detract from the building's special interest or its significance as a designated heritage asset. The **main issue** in both appeals is therefore the effects of the proposed single storey rear extension on the listed building's special interest and significance.
 3. It appears the original three-bay farmhouse dates back to 1744 and was extended in the 19th century with a projecting rear wing and a northward extension. Historic Ordnance Survey maps also indicate there was a substantial group of farm buildings around a courtyard to the west of the farmhouse. However little remains today of that arrangement and functional
-

link and, in relatively recent times, the 18th/19th century building has been subject to extensive alterations and additions. Thus the original three-bay farmhouse is now only a small part of a substantially larger assemblage of built form comprising elements of differing forms, proportions, heights and detailing.

4. The appellant's heritage statement assesses the building's history, special interest and significance. It concludes that the modern alterations and extensions have seriously damaged both the interior and exterior of the listed building, due to major loss of historic plan form and fabric internally and the enveloping effect of extensions on the 18th/19th century building's external form and character. I do not disagree with this part of the assessment and nor it seems does the Council.
5. The statement goes on to conclude the listed building's special architectural and historic interest has been damaged to such an extent that its heritage significance has been severely eroded, "probably beyond the point that the building should be included in the statutory List". Nonetheless, at present it is still a listed building and the statutory duty still applies, as do Core Policies 57 and 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (CS) (2015) and the requirement in the *National Planning Policy Framework* to have regard to the significance of heritage assets.
6. In architectural terms the external form of the 18th/19th century building is still distinguishable at both the front and the rear, albeit slightly less clearly at the rear due in part to the existing conservatory feature which wraps around the projecting rear wing and then steps back to continue across the rear of the northern extension. The 18th/19th century form retains a modest amount of special interest and heritage significance related to its age and features despite the enclosing effect of the existing modern extensions to the north and south. It is a matter of note that demolishing the existing conservatory would improve the ability to appreciate that historic form.
7. In addition the history of the older building's form, function and ownership, detailed in the appellant's heritage statement, will always be of some historic interest, as will the remaining historic fabric. For all these reasons I find that the listed building retains some special interest but that its significance in heritage terms is, at best, no more than modest.
8. The proposed single storey extension would be a very substantial flat-roofed structure with a solid roof and external 'walls' of large-format aluminium-framed glazed panels. Rather than broadly following the shape of the projecting rear element, as does the existing conservatory, the new extension would in effect assimilate that projection into its internal space. Given the combination of its depth and solid roof it would mask the historic building's ground floor to at least as great a degree as the existing conservatory. I find that to be the case even though its height would be very slightly less than the highest part of the existing pitched conservatory roof, its overall width would be marginally less and its impact on historic fabric would be negligible.
9. In addition, whilst I appreciate that extensive use of glazing can often work well in additions to historic buildings, in this case the continuous unbroken width of the extension's rear elevation would not sit harmoniously with any

elements of the existing assemblage of built forms¹ in terms of its proportions. In terms of floorspace also the proposed development would create an uncharacteristically large room. In that respect it would be considerably at odds with the room sizes of the 18th/19th century building to which it would be attached which, notwithstanding loss of original plan form, still allow for some appreciation of the original building's internal arrangement and proportions.

10. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude the proposed rear extension would fail to preserve the listed building's special interest, thereby conflicting with CS Core Policies 57 and 58, and that it would further reduce the building's modest significance as a heritage asset. The resultant harm, in terms of policy guidance in the *Framework*, would be less than substantial but there would be harm nonetheless. Paragraph 134 of the *Framework* expects any such harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
11. In this case however the benefits would be private rather than public and the matter of securing the building's optimum viable use does not arise, such that I find no benefits to weigh in favour of the proposal. Therefore, having concluded that the proposed rear extension would have a harmful effect on the existing building, thereby conflicting with the development plan and with the *Framework*, I conclude that both appeals must fail.

Jane Miles

INSPECTOR

¹ With the possible exception of the pool house extension, albeit this is one of the modern extensions acknowledged in the heritage statement as having damaged the historic building's special interest
