
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2016

by Olivia Spencer BA BSc DipArch RIBA

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

Decision date: 17 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H3320/Y/16/3157201

Gauth House, Tanners Hill, Huish Champflower, Somerset TA4 2EY

- 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 Justin Ayton against the decision of West Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 3/17/15/004, dated 22 November 2015, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2016.
 - The works are described as 're-opening of 1 blocked historic door at ground floor and 3 blocked historic windows at 1st floor, creation of new slot window at 1st floor'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for a door opening at ground floor, 3 windows at first floor and creation of new slot window at 1st floor at Gauth House, Tanners Hill, Huish Champflower, Somerset TA4 2EY in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 3/17/15/004, dated 22 November 2015 and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural matters

2. The works for which consent is sought have been carried out.
3. For the reasons given below, in granting consent I have omitted the references to historic openings given in the description of the works on the application form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the works on the special architectural interest of Gauth House which is listed Grade II.

Reasons

5. Gauth House is a late 16th to early 17th century house that has been extended and altered over time. It has cob and rubble walls with a roughcast finish and a slate roof. The northern extension is taller with an independent roof. The list description states that the house was refenestrated in the early 18th century. This is evident on the eastern elevation which has sliding sash windows of various size and design arranged in irregular bays across the lower frontage, and windows of a more consistent design in 3 essentially regular (albeit slightly off-set) bays on the higher extension.
 6. Whilst there is consistency therefore in the use of vertical sliding sash windows across this elevation, the northern higher extension displays a broadly formal
-

composition that is distinct from the informal character of the lower facade. Together these 2 elements of the eastern frontage contribute significantly to the character of the building and bear witness to its historic evolution. As such they are an important element of its special interest and heritage significance.

7. The 3 windows for which consent is sought on this elevation are all within the lower informal facade. No alteration has been made to the higher facade which retains its characteristic clarity of composition. The windows are small, sit close to the eaves and differ entirely in form from that of the sash windows. They do not therefore appear to compete with, or detract from the visual dominance of the sash windows, nor do they noticeably disrupt the loose arrangement of bays in this part of the eastern frontage. The historic character of the elevation is thus unharmed.
8. The appellant has described all but the slit window as uncovered historic openings. The 2006 planning drawings submitted by the Council suggest the possibility of an historic opening in the gable wall. However other than photographs of cut stone in the wall adjacent to the door opening and what appears to be historic plaster I have seen no conclusive evidence that the works have involved the restoration of original openings. I have not therefore taken the historic existence of the openings into account in reaching my decision.
9. The Council has raised no objection to the door opening or to the window in the gable wall, and given their discrete locations I find no reason to disagree. Whilst there is an alteration to the form and appearance of the eastern facade and southern gable wall, and some minor loss of historic fabric, I conclude for the reasons given that the works preserve the special architectural interest and heritage significance of the listed building. I find no conflict therefore with Policy NH/1 of the West Somerset Local Plan.

Conditions

10. The works have already been carried out and it is not necessary therefore to impose a condition requiring compliance with the application plans. Further the Council has given no reason for the suggest condition requiring approval of render under the oval window. Subsequent alterations and any works other than those hereby authorised that affect the character of the listed building would be subject to control under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act.

Olivia Spencer

INSPECTOR