
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2017

by Roger Catchpole DipHort BSc(hons) PhD MCIEEM

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

Decision date: 31 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/Y/16/3161968

The Old Hayloft, 5 Dike Hill, Low Harley, Rotherham S62 7UL

- 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 Peter Higgins against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: RB2016/0296, dated 7 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2016.
 - The works proposed is described as 'a stone entrance porch not exceeding 3 square meters in area'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for 'a stone entrance porch not exceeding 3 square meters in area' at The Old Hayloft, 5 Dike Hill, Low Harley, Rotherham S62 7UL in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: RB2016/0296 dated 7 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
 - 2) The works hereby authorised shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: RB 2016/0296.
 - 3) The materials to be used for making good any disturbed internal or external surfaces shall be of matching composition, form and finish to those of the adjoining original fabric.
 - 4) No works above ground shall occur until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the structure hereby authorised have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matter

2. As the works have the potential to affect a Listed Building I have had special regard to sections 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether or not the proposed works would preserve a Grade II listed building, Harley Manor House, and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

4. The building was listed in 1979 and was originally constructed in the 16th century with 18th and 19th century additions. It has been subject to 20th century alteration and is subdivided into three separate dwellings. One of the key characteristics of the building is derived from its historical layering. It is constructed from coursed, sandstone rubble and with a variety of roof materials encompassing Welsh slates, stone slates and cement slates.
5. The earliest part of the building is set out in an H-plan with two prominent, gable-ended cross-wings. A house dating from the 18th century has been constructed parallel to the left-hand cross wing whilst a 19th century house, with a contrasting roof pitch and higher eaves, extends from the side elevation of the right-hand cross-wing. Given the above, I find that the special interest of the listed building, insofar as it relates to this appeal, to be primarily related to its historical layering and close juxtaposition of different building techniques and architectural styles.
6. For the purposes of the Act, a listed building includes any structure that is within its curtilage which has existed since before 1st July 1948. As the appeal property is part of a structure within the curtilage that has a principal and accessory relationship to the main building, it is also consequently listed. Whilst the outbuilding is not included in the list description, listings are primarily for identification purposes and do not provide an exhaustive or complete description of the special interest.
7. The appeal property is within a converted outbuilding that has been subdivided into a number of self-contained dwellings. The outbuilding has an L-shaped configuration with a stone wall on one side giving rise to a partially enclosed courtyard. The outbuilding and courtyard are offset from the principal elevation of the main building and the driveway leading from Dike Hill. The position of the access is such that the main building forms the primary, dominant structure whilst the outbuilding plays a more subservient, secondary role. This has been further reinforced by the lawful construction of a modern garage block on the open side of the courtyard, in between the outbuilding and the main building.
8. I observed that the original, agricultural character of the outbuilding has not been preserved, as acknowledged by the Council. The extensive fenestration, use of modern materials, variation in the courtyard levels and a general lack of distinct architectural features associated with its former use is such that it appears as a more recent structure. The extent of the changes that have occurred are akin to the historic evolution of the main house. Consequently, the addition of a diminutive, entrance porch would be read as part of the continuing evolution of the listed building.
9. Although the Council have suggested that the porch would disrupt the rectangular form of the outbuilding, I do not find that this adds to its historic legibility given the extent of the alterations that have already taken place. This includes a number of substantial projections on the south-eastern and north-eastern elevations of the outbuilding. I am therefore satisfied that the entrance porch would not lead to any material change in the highly domesticated nature of this structure.

10. I accept that a heritage statement has not been submitted by the appellant, as required by paragraph 128 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (the Framework). However, such evidence should be no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on the significance of an asset. In this particular instance I am satisfied that potential impacts can be readily determined in the absence of any such evaluation.
11. Given the above, I find that the works would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building thus satisfying the requirements of the Act, paragraph 134 of the Framework and local policies insofar as they seek to implement the Act.

Conclusion and Conditions

12. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and listed building consent granted.
13. In order to protect the special interest of the listed building and its appearance and in addition to the standard time limitation [1] a number of other conditions are necessary to ensure: work is carried out in accordance with the plan [2]; all finishes match existing, original surfaces [3]; and that all new materials match existing, original materials [4].

Roger Catchpole

INSPECTOR