
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2017

by J J Evans BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 02 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/Y/17/3170366

Barnsgate, Honey Knob Hill South, Kington St Michael, SN14 6HX

- 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 Mulholland against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 16/09220/LBC, dated 21 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 January 2017.
 - The works proposed are 2 replacement doors and 1 replacement window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the front door of the building. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the replacement of a rear door and window.
2. Listed building consent is granted for the replacement of a rear door and window at Barnsgate, Honey Knob Hill South, Kington St Michael, SN14 6HX, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 16/09220/LBC, dated 21 September 2016, so far as relevant to that part of the works hereby permitted and the plans submitted with it, and subject to the following conditions:-
 1. The works hereby granted consent shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.
 2. The development hereby consented shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings:-
 - a. Dwg 10269/01;
 - b. Dwg 10269/02 A; and
 - c. Dwg 10269/03 A.
 3. No development shall commence until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the rear window and external door hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out and retained in accordance with the approved details and samples.
 4. Notwithstanding the approved drawings, no works shall be commenced until details of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:-

- a. Large scale details of the rear replacement external door and window at a scale of no less than 1:10 (door) and 1:5 (window) and vertical and horizontal sections including setbacks and reveals at a scale of no less than 1:5 (door) and 1:2 (window);
- b. Details of the proposed stain / paint colour and finish.

The works shall be carried out and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matters

3. Barnsgate is a grade II listed building within the Kington St Michael Conservation Area. As required by Sections 16(2) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) I have paid special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, and of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the replacement doors and window would preserve a grade II listed building, its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses, and linked to that whether the works would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Kington St Michael Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. Home Farmhouse is a large detached house positioned like many of the other historic properties within the village to front the highway. The house contributes towards the historic linear form of the village and this along with its associated farmyard and outbuildings spreading out behind it, reflects the historic linkages of the property with both the village and the agricultural land. As such the farm makes a positive contribution to the significance of the conservation area.
6. Barnsgate is a former agricultural building within Home Farm that has been converted into a dwelling. Constructed of coursed rubble stone under a tiled roof, the appeal property is part of a long range of single storey buildings that comprised part of the former farmstead. Although the buildings within the farm have been converted to dwellings, they have mostly retained their simple utilitarian agricultural forms. Their positioning reflects their former subservient relationship to the house as well as their functional relationship with the yard, with each other and with the agricultural land beyond them. This and the construction of the building from local traditional materials is part of the special interest and significance of this listed building and of the conservation area.
7. The proposal seeks to replace the existing kitchen window, the kitchen door and the front door. The Council have raised no objection to the replacement of the single paned kitchen window with a similar one. On the basis of the evidence before me, I agree with this view as the window would have a plain appearance that would harmonise with the simplicity of the building.
8. The permission for the conversion of the building occurred in the late 1980s. Since that time a number of changes have occurred to the building, including

the addition of a rear conservatory. I do not have the original form of the barn before me, but the Council have pointed out that design principles for conversions have changed over the years. I appreciate this is the case, but in this instance the presence of the conservatory gives a residential character and appearance to the rear of the building. This combined with the regularly spaced French doors and the cluster of vent pipes in the roof gives the rear of the building a distinct domestic appearance. Although a half-timbered door would have a domestic style, it would be seen within the context of the rear of the building and as such it would not unacceptably erode the special interest.

9. However, the replacement front door would be fully timbered with vertical glazed side panels, and as such it would have a domestic appearance that would be at harmful odds with the functional simplicity of the former agricultural building. I appreciate the use of the building has changed due to its conversion, and that there has been a partial demolition of the range to create an access. Nevertheless, the front of the building has retained its essentially agricultural functional form and appearance. The presence of tall single paned windows and doors has retained wide former openings, and therefore the relationship of the building with the yard. The solid style of the front door with side glazing would have a domestic appearance that would erode the historic legibility of the front of the building.
10. I appreciate the replacement door would not result in the loss of historic fabric, and note the comments of the appellant that stable doors are a traditional feature of agricultural buildings. However, I have no evidence before me that such a door upon the front of this building would be appropriate with regard to its former use.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to other timber doors nearby. However, these doors are within very different buildings, and that within Cherry Tree Barn is positioned within what appears to be a former cart entrance. Nor do I have the full planning history of these properties, and in any case each scheme has to be treated on its own individual merits, as I have undertaken in this instance.
12. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires that great weight should be given to the significance of designated heritage assets. The appellant has pointed out that the door would not be readily seen from public views. Nevertheless, the requirements of the Framework and the statutory duties of the Act apply in all cases, even when not visible from the public realm.
13. In view of the scale of the works and the current form and usage of the buildings and the farmstead, the proposed doors and window would have a neutral impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area and upon the settings of nearby listed buildings. However, for the reasons given the replacement front door would harm the special interest of a listed building. This would be contrary to the requirements of the Act and the objectives of the Framework.
14. The Framework also requires that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case the works would result in less than substantial harm due to the comparative size of the door compared to that of the building as a whole. The

appellant has referred to the existing door needing to be replaced with a wider one and that there would be improved energy efficiency. Such improvements would be a modest public benefit, but the need for a wider front door of the style proposed has not been demonstrated nor that the existing one unacceptably restricts use. As such the front door would only be of a limited public benefit, and this would not outweigh the harm I have found.

Conditions

15. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against paragraph 206 of the Framework. Where necessary and in the interests of clarity and precision they have been altered to better reflect these requirements. I have imposed the standard time condition and one requiring the consented works to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, so as to avoid doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
16. To protect the special interest of the listed building, its setting and that of others, and also the character and appearance of the conservation area, conditions are necessary to require details of the development hereby permitted. To that end I have imposed a condition requiring details of the materials of the rear window and door. The colour of the replacement joinery was not specified on the original application, although details of a paint and colour were subsequently considered by the Council. Consequently I have also imposed a condition requiring details of the stain / paint finish and colour for the door and window hereby consented.

Conclusion

17. The scheme involves a number of different elements that are physically and functionally independent. In this respect I find the proposed rear window and door to be acceptable and clearly severable from the replacement front door. Therefore I propose to issue a split decision in this case and grant listed building consent for the rear door and window, but dismiss the appeal insofar as it relates to the replacement of the front door.
18. Thus, for the reasons given above, and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal is part allowed and part dismissed.

J J Evans

INSPECTOR