



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2017

by S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA

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

Decision date: 7th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/Y/17/3167664

45 The Green, Quainton HP22 4AR

- 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 and Annie White against the decision of Aylesbury Vale District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/03531/ALB, dated 28 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2016.
 - The works proposed are single storey rear extension and new pitched/flat roof to existing single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

2. The building is listed Grade II and lies within the Quainton Conservation Area, the main issue in this Appeal is the effect of the works on the significance of the listed building and its setting.
3. Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 72(1) of the same Act requires special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. The courts have determined that considerable importance and weight should be given to harm found to the significance of listed buildings.
4. The proposal is in two parts, firstly the addition of a shallow extension out from the brick-built part of the rear elevation, and secondly the addition of a false-pitch roof to an existing extension, to also cover the new addition. The appellant states that the roof works are not essential but are considered desirable in improving the appearance of the building. Certainly the present arrangement of the previous addition is somewhat incongruous, being large and uncompromising in its effect with a flat felt roof too clearly visible.
5. The part of the dwelling to which the proposed addition would be attached is the less historically significant area, being a brick infill between two timber-

framed wings, a third being to the west. Nevertheless, the brick part does have some architectural significance and reads well within the overall arrangement. The same cannot be said of the flat roofed addition which in its present form detracts from the architectural significance of the building and obscures, or would have brought about the removal of items that were once likely to have been of historic interest.

6. In the context of the building as a whole, and those parts that are of particular significance, the proposed addition would be limited and would not remove fabric of particular importance. However, the proposed roof has not been fully considered as contributing to the significance of the more historic parts, introducing an inappropriate hip end that, due to the side wall extending along the same plane as that of the original brick part, would appear unresolved and unattractive, detracting from the balance of the rear area where not presently affected by the previous extension. The proposal to add a false-pitch roof to that earlier part would appear similarly unresolved due to the flat roof remaining in the centre.
7. Whilst the introduction of an extension here could, in itself, be acceptable due to its small size and limited effects, the failing is in trying to improve the appearance of the flat roof extension, which has not succeeded sufficiently, and this has led to failings in the design of the extension roof and the relationship of both to the main building. Removing the roofs to both parts at appeal, as suggested by the appellant would not be a safe way forward without detailed proposals and risks extending the visual harm already caused by the present flat roof.
8. As designed, the proposal would cause harm to the architectural significance of the listed building, although it is less certain that there would be any real effect on the character and appearance of the conservation area. The level of harm is 'less than substantial', a differentiation required between paragraphs 133 and 134 of the Framework. In this case the latter applies and this states that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
9. There does not appear to be any risk of the building falling out of its use as a dwelling, or falling into disrepair by reason of not having a larger breakfast area. There may be public benefits in an owner being in a better position to care for a building due to works being carried out, but that does not appear the case here. What is required is a re-appraisal of the scheme to include the present extension as a holistic design, so that the public benefits can be said to include a truly worthwhile improvement in the rear of the building. That cannot be said at present.
10. The proposed works would cause harm to a designated heritage asset that is not outweighed by public benefits and hence would be contrary to the aims of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and chapter 12 of the Framework on conserving the historic environment. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR