
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 26 June 2019

by Mr J P Sargent BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26 July 2019

Appeal A: APP/J3720/W/19/3223132

The Old Post Office, Henley Road, Great Alne B49 6HX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Matthew Buckley against the decision of Stratford on Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref 18/02828/FUL, dated 24 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Appeal B: APP/J3720/Y/19/3223145

The Old Post Office, Henley Road, Great Alne B49 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 Matthew Buckley against the decision of Stratford on Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref 18/02829/LBC, dated 24 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2018.
 - The works proposed are the erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension at The Old Post Office, Henley Road, Great Alne B49 6HX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/02828/FUL, dated 24 September 2018, subject to the conditions in the Conditions Schedule below.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension at The Old Post Office, Henley Road, Great Alne B49 6HX in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 18/02829/LBC, dated 24 September 2018 subject to the conditions in the Conditions Schedule below.

Main Issues

3. The main issue common to both appeals is whether the proposal would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of this Grade II listed building, whether it would preserve the character or appearance of the Great

Alne Conservation Area, and its effect on the significance of these 2 heritage assets. A further issue relevant to Appeal A only is whether it is not inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

Reasons

The effect on the designated heritage assets

4. The Old Post Office¹ was built as a timber-framed cottage in the 17th Century. Its significance lies, in part, in the way in which its external appearance and its internal arrangement continue to reflect its original historic form. In the mid to late 19th Century the entire rear elevation was rebuilt in brick, and to my mind this contributes to its significance by demonstrating the evolution of the building. Furthermore, in 1999, a 2-storey rear extension (the 1999 extension) was added to approximately half of the rear elevation of the cottage. While this extension is of a relatively sympathetic design it is nonetheless a large addition to the original dwelling.
5. The effect of these changes means the back of the house is now 'L'-shaped with the rear elevation in its rebuilt form apparent on one side, and the 1999 extension projecting out on the other.
6. The proposal is to run from the rebuilt rear elevation along the side of the 1999 extension. Visually it would be relatively light with a timber and glazed frame standing on a brick base, and to my mind this would be a sensitive design approach to extending this cottage. Moreover, it would not be 'squaring off' this 'L'-shape, but would be set back from both the rear elevation of the 1999 extension and the original side wall of the house. This arrangement would serve to reduce its dominance and ensure that a large amount of older brickwork on the rear wall remained apparent. Taking these factors together, the works would not be unduly prominent and would not result in harm to the appreciation or understanding of the building when seen from the back.
7. This scheme would be creating further floorspace to what was formed by the 1999 extension. However, when compared to that, the proposal would be much lighter and far more subservient, and it would be perceived as a simple ancillary addition of the sort often added to houses over time. As a result, it would be read in a very different way in relation to the historic property. Given this, I consider harm would not result from any cumulative or combined impact of the 2 extensions.
8. The proposal would form an opening in what is now the outer wall of the kitchen. However, the confined nature of this room and the overall plan-form of the house would still be apparent due to the opening's limited dimensions.
9. Finally, some 2.4sqm of older brickwork beneath and to one side of the kitchen window would be lost, but given its scale and condition, I have no reason to consider this would be harmful to the significance of the building or to its special architectural or historic interest. There is a beam above the kitchen window that is indicated at differing heights on Proposed Section A-A and Proposed Section B-B. The appellant has confirmed that the former shows his intentions, and that the beam is to be retained. Moreover, he has also confirmed the limited headroom provided would be acceptable.

¹ Also referred to as Cutlers Farmhouse and Cottage Farm on the listing details

10. In the light of the above I find the scheme would not harm the listed building. I appreciate that the Council said the opportunities to be offered by the proposal could be accommodated in the existing house. However, I have noted the appellant's points in relation to this, and as I find the scheme does not cause harm that does not offer a basis to resist the proposal.
11. The significance of the Great Alne Conservation Area lies partly in how it encompasses various buildings and open spaces that show the incremental way in which this settlement has developed over the years. Mindful that I consider the works would not adversely affect this listed building, I also find no harm would be caused to the significance of the conservation area.
12. Accordingly, I conclude that the works would not harm the special architectural or historic interest of this Grade II listed building, they would not fail to preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area, and they would not harm the significance of either of these designated heritage assets. As such, they would not be contrary to Policy CS.8 in the *Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy 2011-2031*.

Green Belt

13. The site is within the Green Belt, where Government guidance states the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate development. However, it gives some exceptions to this, one of which is

'the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building'.

What constitutes '*disproportionate*' is not defined, and so it falls to the reasonable discretion of the decision-maker.

14. The Council has found that the proposal, when taken with the 1999 extension, does not constitute a disproportionate addition to the original property. As such, it found it would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Mindful of this I have no reason to come to a different view, and so also conclude this would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Conditions

15. In order to safeguard the historic integrity of the building, conditions are necessary requiring the agreement of materials and the detailing of the timber.

Conclusions

16. For the reasons stated I allow both appeals.

JP Sargent

INSPECTOR

CONDITIONS SCHEDULE

Appeal A

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) Unless otherwise amended under the conditions below, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: Drawings 283/17/102B, 106B, /108, /109, /110, /111, and /112 (insofar as it does not contradict Drawing 283/17/111).
- 3) No development above ground level shall be undertaken until samples of the external materials, the joint details, the brick bond, and the details of the mortar mix have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall then be undertaken in accordance with those approved details only
- 4) No development above ground level shall be undertaken until details of the sections and profiles of the timber framing and door at a scale of 1:10, together with details of the reveals and the external treatment for the timber have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall then be undertaken in accordance with those approved details only.

Appeal B

- 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
- 2) Unless otherwise amended under the conditions below, the works shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: Drawings 283/17/102B, 106B, /108, /109, /110, /111, and /112 (insofar as it does not contradict Drawing 283/17/111).
- 3) No works above ground level shall be undertaken until samples of the external materials, the joint details, the brick bond, and the details of the mortar mix have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall then be undertaken in accordance with those approved details only
- 4) No works above ground level shall be undertaken until details of the sections and profiles of the timber framing and door at a scale of 1:10, together with details of the reveals and the external treatment for the timber have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall then be undertaken in accordance with those approved details only.