
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 29 July 2019

by Neil Pope BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 August 2019

Appeal A Ref: APP/G1250/W/18/3207413

6, Wick Farm, Wick Green, Bournemouth, Dorset, BH6 4LY.

- 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 A Green against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council (the LPA).
 - The application Ref. 7-2018-2710-AQ, dated 7 December 2017, was refused by notice dated 8 May 2018.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of loft space served by two heritage style conservation rooflights.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/G1250/Y/18/3207416

6, Wick Farm, Wick Green, Bournemouth, Dorset, BH6 4LY.

- 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 A Green against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council (the LPA).
 - The application Ref. 7-2018-2710-AR, dated 7 December 2017, was refused by notice dated 8 May 2018.
 - The works proposed are the conversion of loft space served by two heritage style conservation rooflights.
-

Decisions

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The LPA is now Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
3. The appeal site forms part of a group of grade II listed former farm buildings at Wick Farm and lies within the Wick Farm Conservation Area (CA).
4. The submitted plans were amended prior to the LPA's determination of the applications. These show two new rooflights on the front rather than the rear elevation of the building. Permission/consent was refused on the basis of these amended plans. An appeal must relate to a single scheme not alternative proposals and should be determined on the basis of the plans specified within an LPA's decision notice. It would be inappropriate for me to consider both sets of drawings as suggested by the appellant's planning consultant.
5. As part of its Statement, the LPA has informed me that in addition to the proposed rooflights it has concerns over the proposed extended staircase.

Main Issue

6. The main issue in both appeals is whether the proposals would preserve the grade II listed former barn at Wick Farm and preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

Reasons

7. Nos. 5-7 comprise a former barn (now in residential use) that part encloses the historic farmyard to Wick Farm. The significance of this listed building is derived primarily from its architectural qualities, which include its plan form, brick walls, half-hipped slate roof, as well as its historic qualities, which include its previous associations with agriculture in this part of Dorset.
8. Although the works of adaptation for residential use (that include a new roof, windows and rooflights) have altered the character and appearance of this listed building, the simple form of the barn has been retained and its previous function and some of its rural charm can still be discerned. I understand that the scheme of adaptation received a design award in 1985.
9. The CA is a generally linear area that follows the southern section of the River Stour adjacent to Christchurch Harbour. It includes various listed and vernacular buildings, a Scheduled Monument (SM) bowl barrow, a recreation ground and a former care home. The significance of the CA is derived primarily from its architectural qualities, which include the contribution made by its listed and vernacular buildings, as well as its historic qualities, which include the SM and the associations with the river and the surrounding countryside.
10. The proposed rooflights would sit above two of the existing rooflights in the front roof slope of the appellant's property. They would be flush fitting with the slates and smaller in size than the row of nine rooflights that have been inserted across the roof slope of Nos. 5-7.
11. The existing rooflights are unfortunate breaks in the roof slope and are alien to the traditional form and appearance of this former agricultural building. However, they are set just above the eaves line and with the exception of a couple of soil/vent pipes, the building continues to have a largely unbroken upper expanse of slates on this roof slope. This was a feature of this former barn prior to the works of adaptation and assists in maintaining its integrity.
12. The proposal would further disrupt the roof slope and the introduction of a second row of rooflights into the currently unbroken expanse of slates would harm the integrity of the building. I concur with the LPA's Conservation Officer that these works to the roof slope would accentuate the domestic appearance of the building, amount to inappropriate clutter and further erode its traditional character and appearance. It would diminish the ability to appreciate and understand the heritage interest of this former barn. In the context of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), it would comprise less than substantial harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset.
13. As I noted during my site visit, the appeal building can be seen from some parts of the public realm. This includes the road to the south, as well as sections of the popular Stour Valley Way. Whilst the rear roof slope (also containing rooflights) is more prominent, parts of the front roof slope are visible. The above noted harm to the listed building would also erode the character of the CA. This inappropriate roof clutter would be apparent from the

- public realm and detract from the appearance of the CA. It would comprise less than substantial harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset.
14. During my visit, I also viewed the staircase and loft space. There is nothing to demonstrate that the proposed extended staircase would harm any internal features or result in the loss of any important historic building fabric.
 15. However, less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets does not amount to a less than substantial planning objection. As set out within the Framework, great weight should be given to an asset's conservation. Where development would lead to less than substantial harm this should be weighed against any public benefits of a proposal.
 16. Even if the appellant's agent is correct in arguing that the proposal would secure a public benefit by providing a more functional dwelling to better serve the needs of a changing housing market¹, this would be insufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified. Furthermore, the upper level rooflight on no.4 (which forms part of a different building) and the flat roof on the former care home that are unsympathetic additions to the CA do not justify setting aside the harmful impact of the appeal scheme.
 17. The proposal would fail to preserve the grade II listed former barn at Wick Farm and would harm the character and appearance of the CA. It would be at odds with policy CS39 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy² and the provisions of the Framework that are aimed at conserving and enhancing the historic environment.
 18. Having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that both appeals should not succeed.

Neil Pope

Inspector

¹ It would be very surprising if the proposals had any perceptible effect on the operation of the housing market.

² The most relevant development plan policy to the determination of appeal A but of limited weight in appeal B.