
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2017

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: 28 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/Y/16/3161679

Greystones Cottage, Butterow West, Stroud, Gloucestershire GL5 3UA

- 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 Terry Guildford against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.16/0318/LBC, dated 12 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2016.
 - The works are described as "retrospective application for both front and back door, fence at the front of the property, porch to the front of the house, lean to shelter to the back of the property and barge board/fascia".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for front and back door, fence at the front of the property, porch to the front of the house, lean to shelter to the back of the property and barge board/fascia at Greystones Cottage, Butterow West, Stroud GL5 3UA in accordance with the terms of the application reference S.16/0318/LBC dated 12 February 2016 and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issues

2. The evidence confirms that, following the refusal of the application to which this appeal relates, the Council granted listed building consent for an application to retain works similar in all respects to the works which are the subject of this appeal excepting the fence at the front of the property which was omitted from the consent sought. All of the works described in the heading above have been carried out.
3. I therefore consider the **main issues** in this appeal are whether the fence at the front of the property:
 - (i) preserves the listed building known as Greystones Cottage (listed Grade II as "Butter Row West, Princess Royal Cottages no 3") or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses; and
 - (ii) preserves the setting of adjacent listed buildings.

Reasons

4. Greystone Cottage dates from the early 19C and, whilst it is now a dwelling, was formerly a public house. It is a two storey stone building with attic dormers in a Cotswold stone tiled roof. The cottage is attached to 1&2 Princess Royal Cottages and forms a group with these and with Nos 1 and 2 Prospect
-

Cottages and with Elm Cottage on the opposite side of Butter Row West. Each of these properties are listed, Grade II. Greystone Cottage and Princess Royal Cottages form an attractive but simple terrace constructed from coursed rubble stone. Architectural detailing is generally simple and unobtrusive. The evidence refers to former weavers' cottages in Butterow West.

5. The fence is in the approximate position of a former wall. This wall is shown in a photograph of 2011 as having been of red brick with a coping stone and positioned between Greystone Cottage and the neighbouring property to the east. The photograph also shows a short length of low stone wall at the back edge of the pavement. The written evidence refers to the fence being lower than that of the previous wall.
6. The timber fence has been created from a series of vertical oak railway sleepers held together with steel braces. The overall appearance of the fence, whilst not traditional, is one of a robust and solid barrier with a simple form. The size and mass of the fence is akin to that of a wall, albeit constructed of wood. Given these characteristics and the use of timber on the front porch of the cottage, I find that the fence does not appear out of place. It respects the simple form of Greystones Cottage and its immediate neighbour. The distance between the fence and the existing brick wall on the west side of Greystone Cottages is sufficient for the difference in their appearance not to appear incongruous.
7. Overall, the impact of the fence on the significance of Greystone Cottage and on the setting of the cottage immediately to the east is neutral. The fence is not visually intrusive and its effect on the wider setting including the setting of other listed cottages in the immediate area is not harmful.
8. I have had regard to Policy ES10 of the Stroud District Local Plan (adopted November 2015) which relates to valuing the historic environment and assets. Whilst the fence does not enhance the architectural or historic interest of the listed building, it does preserve it and therefore I find no substantive conflict with Policy ES10.
9. Although not national policy, the Council draws attention to paragraphs 42 and 43 of Historic England's Advice Note 2 "Making Changes to Heritage Assets". Whilst I am referred to the loss of historic fabric, the demolition of the wall previously on the site is not part of the works for which consent is sought. There is no evidence to suggest that the junction between the stone front elevation of the house and the fence has resulted in damage or that the works to erect the fence could not be reversed. Consequently I find no material conflict with these sections of the advice note.
10. The Framework requires great weight be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets. I have found that there is no harm to such assets and therefore no conflict with Section 12 of the Framework.

Other matters

11. The appellant's evidence refers to the intention to replace the red brick wall to the right of the cottage and alongside the public footpath. For the avoidance of doubt, this does not form part of the works before me for consideration and has not had any bearing on my decision.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the fence preserves the special interest of Greystone Cottage and its setting and preserves the setting of adjacent listed buildings. The appeal is therefore allowed.
13. No conditions are suggested and as the works have already been carried out no conditions are necessary.

J E Tempest

INSPECTOR