
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 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: 16 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/Y/16/3160088

2 Lynch Road, Berkeley GL13 9TA

- 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 Ian Wasley against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.16/0794/LBC, dated 8 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2016.
 - The works proposed are single storey extension to rear and associated alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was submitted to the Council on a single householder application form seeking planning permission and listed building consent. A valid appeal was made only in respect of the refusal of listed building consent and accordingly this decision only addresses matters related to this appeal.

Main Issues

3. These are whether the proposed works would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Berkeley Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. No 2 Lynch Road dates from the mid/late 18th century. It is a Grade II listed building and lies within the Berkeley Conservation Area. Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCAA) states that, in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works, special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. As the appeal building is in a conservation area, I am also required to take account of Section 72(1) of the LBCAA which states that, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. These expectations are reflected in Delivery Policy ES10 of the Stroud District Local Plan¹ (SDLP) of which paragraphs 2A and 2D are relevant to this proposal.

¹ Stroud District Local Plan adopted 19 November 2015

5. In March 2013 works to demolish a washroom and erect a ground floor extension at the rear of the property were dismissed following an appeal² ("the 2013 appeal"). The Inspector determining that appeal described the property as having a distinctive plan form. This comprises a broadly rectangular main block and a single storey wing to the rear which incorporates a distinctive chimney stack. The main block is larger in scale and more elaborate in design than the rear wing which is smaller in scale and more functional in design. The Inspector identified the relationship between the primary and secondary elements of the building as being an integral part of the special interest and significance of the listed building. From the evidence and what I observed during my site visit, I concur with this assessment of the existing building.
6. The proposal before me seeks to address matters set out in the 2013 appeal decision. The existing washhouse or service wing would be retained in the current scheme rather than being subsumed within the proposed extension. The proposed dining room extension would therefore be distinct from the service wing and the two storey dwelling, but attached to both. The height of the proposed north elevation of the extension would be below the cill level of the existing first floor windows, aiming to maintain a distinction in scale between different elements of the building. The extent of glazing within the extension would to some extent mitigate the impact of the extension in obscuring the service wing.
7. I acknowledge that significant changes have been made in response to the 2013 decision. Nonetheless, the roof and eaves design of the extension which is now proposed would result in an awkward and incongruous junction with the roof of the service wing. This arrangement would harm the integrity and simple form of the service wing. Whilst the fabric of the existing building would not be lost and flashings could be hidden under the slates of the service wing roof slope, this would not overcome the harm to the architectural interest of the building I have identified. The limited public view of this element of the proposed works does not justify works which would be harmful to the special interest of the listed building. The proposed roof lantern would introduce a feature which would be at odds with the character of the existing building including the simplicity of the service wing. The fenestration pattern would detract from the rhythm and appearance of the existing north elevation. The proposed extension would fail to maintain the clear distinction between the main body of the house and the service wing.
8. Taking the proposed works as a whole, they would fail to preserve the architectural and historic interest of the listed building and would diminish the significance of the listed building. The proposals would therefore not meet the expectations set out in the LBCAA.
9. The house occupies a prominent position on a road junction in the conservation area. Whilst views are restricted by the existing fence the rear of the building, including part of the service wing, is nonetheless visible from outside the site. Therefore, the proposals would fail to preserve and so would not enhance the character or the appearance of the conservation area.
10. The proposed works would fail to comply with Policy ES10 of the SDLP which requires the District's historic environment be preserved, protected or enhanced. When considered in the context of the National Planning Policy

² APP/C1625/A/12/2187106 & APP/C1625/E/12/2187105

Framework (Framework), the proposals would result in less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets. Nonetheless, the Framework requires any harm to such assets to be clearly justified. The Framework aims to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations. Whilst enlarging the appeal property would create more space in this family house, the public benefits of the proposal would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm to the listed building and conservation area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having taken into account all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

J E Tempest

INSPECTOR