The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 15 August 2016

by J E Tempest BA(Hons) MA PGDip PGCertHE MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 26th January 2017

Appeal A: Ref: APP/V3310/W/16/3151185
Stone Barton, Badgworth Lane, Badgworth, Axbridge, Somerset BS26 2QH

- 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 and Mrs D Stafford against the decision of Sedgemoor District Council.
- The application Ref 03/15/00029, dated 16 November 2015, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2016.
- The development proposed is various single storey extensions.

Appeal B: Ref: APP/V3310/Y/16/3151191
Stone Barton, Badgworth Lane, Badgworth, Axbridge, Somerset BS26 2QH

- 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 and Mrs D Stafford against the decision of Sedgemoor District Council.
- The application Ref 03/16/0001, dated 6 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2016.
- The works proposed are various single storey extensions.

Decision

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The address and postcode of the property in the headings above are taken from the Council's decision notices.

3. The appellants' evidence states that the appeal property is not within the curtilage of the neighbouring property, Badgworth Grange, which was listed, grade II, in 1961. It is not disputed that the site was formerly associated with Badgworth Grange and shares its listed status. The appellants submitted applications for planning permission and listed building consent for the proposed works. I have determined the appeals on this basis.

4. The proposals were amended during the course of the Council's determination of the applications. My decisions are based on the proposals shown on drawing S5411/101F which is the drawing determined by the Council. The descriptions of development and works given above are taken from the applications as originally submitted.

Main Issues

5. In respect of both appeals these are whether the proposed development and works would preserve the curtilage listed building known as Stone Barton or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses and whether the proposals would preserve the setting of the listed building known as Badgworth Grange.

Reasons

6. Stone Barton is a converted building and is a dwelling comprising a two storey building with single storey elements to the north and south. A projecting single storey wing to the west lies alongside the boundary with Badgworth Grange. The planning history of the appeal site refers to applications in 1998 for the conversion and extension of a barn to form a new dwelling. There is reference to the building having been extended to the rear when it was converted in 2001. The appeal proposals include a Heritage Statement submitted by the appellants although this does not include a detailed analysis of the history of the appeal property or its former use in connection with Badgworth Grange. The Council's reasons for refusing the proposals refer to the simple historic, rural character of the existing converted dwelling.

7. From my inspection of the site, I consider that the significance of the appeal building derives from it having been a former outbuilding or agricultural building associated with Badgworth Grange. Part of the northern elevation of the appeal property is attached to Badgworth Grange. Externally, Stone Barton retains clear visual evidence of its historic form notwithstanding its extension. The two storey element of the property has a hipped roof covered in slate, whilst the single storey elements include single and double pitched roofs clad in clay tiles. The existing building, including the projecting wing at the rear, has a high proportion of solid stone walls in relation to window openings. The existing kitchen wing incorporates full height and full width glazing but this is set back under the roof line and behind the projecting side walls of the building. The simple form of the existing building retains historic interest and makes a positive contribution to the significance of Badgworth Grange.

8. Stone Barton lies in close proximity to Badgworth Grange and the listing description states that the rear wing of Badgworth Grange dates from the 17C. The upper parts of this wing, which runs parallel to the boundary with Stone Barton, includes windows facing towards the appeal site. The rear wing and the side of the front range of Badgworth Grange are visible from the garden of Stone Barton.

9. The proposals would extend the existing bedroom wing to the rear of the appeal property, adding to its length and width. The ridge line of the existing wing would be continued such that the proposed extension would have an asymmetrical gable and roof form. The extension would run alongside the boundary with Badgworth Grange and would obscure views of part of the southern elevation of that property from the garden of Stone Barton. Although the extension would not be directly attached to the historic rear elevation of Stone Barton, the increased width of the proposed bedroom extension would mask views of part of the rear elevation.

10. The proposed orangery extension would have a flat roof incorporating a framed rooflight. This element of the works would be attached directly to the west elevation of the building and span across part of the two storey and single storey

elements of the existing building. The proposed garden room extension would echo the style of the existing single storey kitchen wing, with a similar span, roof form and in-set full height glazing.

11. The combination of the proposed extensions would alter and mask much of the west elevation of the existing building. The extent of glazing proposed in the western elevations of the extensions would be at odds with the character and appearance of the existing property. Taken as a whole, the proposals would introduce a disparate variety of roof forms which would not be in keeping with the traditional and simple character of the existing building.

12. Although Stone Barton sits within a relatively large plot, the combined scale of the extensions would overwhelm the scale of the existing building such that the significance of its origins as an ancillary building associated with Badgworth Grange would be diminished. Accordingly, whilst the materials for the proposed extensions would be appropriate, the extensions overall would result in a significant diminution of the character of the existing building and would harm its significance. This in turn would cause harm to the setting of Badgworth Grange and diminish its significance.

13. Whilst the appellants' evidence highlights the lack of any alterations to the front elevation of Stone Barton, considerations of the effect of proposals upon a listed building encompass any works which affect the building's special architectural or historic interest and its setting. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) defines setting as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced[1] and advises that a setting may evolve over time.

14. Having regard to Section 12 of the Framework, any harm to heritage assets requires clear justification. The conservation of designated heritage assets is a matter to which I give great weight. Whilst the proposals would amount to less than substantial harm in the context of Paragraph 134 of the Framework, any public benefit arising from the proposals would be limited and would be insufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.

15. I find that the proposals would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of Stone Barton and so would fail to preserve it. The proposals would fail to preserve the setting of Badgworth Grange. Accordingly, the proposals would be contrary to Policy D17 of the Core Strategy[2] as the proposals would fail to enhance and maintain the historic environment. The development would also fail to comply with Policy D2 of the Core Strategy to the extent that it would not reflect the particular local characteristics of the site and with Policy P6 insofar as the development would not maintain or enhance the environment.

Conclusions

16. For the reasons given above, and having taken into account all matters raised, I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

J E Tempest

INSPECTOR

[1] National Planning Policy Framework, Annex 2.
[2] Sedgemoor District Council, Sedgemoor Core Strategy 2006-27 adopted 2011