
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 31 January 2017

by Cullum J A Parker BA(Hons) MA MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 17th February 2017

Appeal A Ref: APP/R0335/W/16/3159400

Acacia Cottage, Forest Road, Binfield RG42 4HL

- 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 Kayll against the decision of Bracknell Forest Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00507/FUL/RFULZ, dated 23 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as *'the demolition of the conservatory. The Construction of a rear single storey extension in matching materials. The construction of a glass link section connecting to the current rear elevation wall to the new extension.'*
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/R0335/Y/16/3159405

Acacia Cottage, Forest Road, Binfield RG42 4HL

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (PLBCA) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Kayll against the decision of Bracknell Forest Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00508/LB/RLBZ, dated 23 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2016.
 - The works proposed are described as *'the demolition of the conservatory. The Construction of a rear single storey extension in matching materials. The construction of a glass link section connecting to the current rear elevation wall to the new extension.'*
-

Decisions

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue for both appeals is whether the proposals would preserve the Grade II listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is an early 19th Century villa, with painted stucco wall and slate hipped roof, as identified in the listing description. To the rear there is a two storey extension, the lower part which I understand was added in about 1948, with a first floor element added in around 1987. At around the same time as the first floor rear extension, a timber framed conservatory was also added to the property, which the current scheme seeks to demolish.
-

Nevertheless, even with the mid to late 20th Century additions, it is possible to see the historic heart of the property. It is from the appearance of the listed from which its significance in part derives.

4. The appeal scheme seeks the removal of the late 1980s conservatory, which both parties broadly agree contributes little to the significance of the listed building. I see no reason to disagree given its relatively limited architectural quality and style. However, this would be replaced with a large building linked by a glass corridor. The extension itself, with a large hipped roof form and both double French doors and top hung lights, would have a domestic appearance more akin to a small bungalow rather than an extension to a residential property. Indeed, given the footprint proposed, the height and the bulk of the extension, it would appear as a competing feature within the grounds of the property rather than as a subservient extension.
5. This would be exacerbated not only by the scale, size and form of the extension, but also by the use of the glass link. The glass link would add to the visual separation between main the structures, but in doing so would make the extension appear as a large quasi-independent outbuilding within the grounds of the property rather than as an integral part of the building and its evolution.
6. I note the findings of the appellant's Heritage Assessment undertaken by MGS Architects & Planning Consultants (undated), which found that the removal of the conservatory would better reveal the character and appearance of the listed building and that the proposed extension would represent a further evolution of the building. However, given the scale, bulk and form of the extension, it would obscure views of the rear of the building, including how it replicates the width and height of the historic core. As such, the proposal would result in a negative impact on the listed building and its setting and would therefore fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building.
7. Paragraphs 131 to 134 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) sets out degrees of harm to designated heritage assets as substantial or less than substantial. Although neither terms is fully defined, given that the fabric of the historic heart of the building would remain unaffected, I consider there to be no more than less than substantial harm in this case. However, less than substantial harm does not equate to less than substantial planning objection. Indeed, I am required to give considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, as set out in Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the PLBCA.
8. Paragraph 134 of the Framework indicates that where less than substantial harm is identified this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The appellant has not put forward any clear public benefits. As such, I do not find that there are any public benefits that outweigh the harm I have found.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the Grade II listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to Policies CS1 and CS7 of the *Core Strategy Development Plan Document*, Policy EN20 of the *Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan*, and Policies BF1 and BF2 of the *Binfield Neighbourhood Plan - 2015-2026* January 2016, (as supported by the Character Areas Assessments SPD), which, amongst other aims, seeks to retain historic buildings that contribute to the historic and architectural interest of the

village and where proposals are not justified by public benefits it would not be supported. It would also be contrary to the Policies of the Framework, which beyond those already cited, include conserving heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Overall Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

Cullum J A Parker

INSEPECTOR