The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2019

by Paul Griffiths BSc(Hons) BArch IHBC

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

Decision date: 02 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W1145/Y/19/3229142
Brendon Farm, Halwill, Beaworthy EX21 5UH

- 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 J Ovens against the decision of Torridge District Council.
- The application Ref.1/1078/2018/LBC, dated 5 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2018.
- The works proposed are a garden room.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for a garden room at Brendon Farm, Halwill, Beaworthy EX21 5UH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref.1/1078/2018/LBC, dated 5 October 2018, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than three years from the date of this consent.

   2) No works shall take place until details/samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details/samples.

Main Issue

2. The farmhouse dates from the 17th Century, or earlier, and is a Grade II listed building. The main issue to be considered, therefore, is the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest (or significance) of the listed building (a designated heritage asset).

Reasons

3. I agree with the Council that the special interest of the listed building lies in its vernacular character, linear plan form and what remains of its historic fabric[1].

4. The extension proposed would be relatively large in terms of its footprint, and it would have an orthogonal relationship with the linear form of the main building. However, it would be single-storey and joined to the main building with a glazed link. As such, it would very clearly defer to the main building, which would remain the dominant element in the composition.

[1] It appears that the building was repaired extensively after a fire in the early to mid C20

5. Allied to that, far from being a difficulty, as the Council suggests, the contemporary design approach taken to the extension, in terms of its form and appearance, and use of materials, would set it apart from the farmhouse as an obvious modern addition. As a result, the orthogonal relationship with the listed building would not obscure the historic linear form of the farmhouse. Moreover, as the Council accepts, the nature of the link to the main building means that there would be no loss of any historic fabric.

6. On that overall basis, subject to a condition to give the Council some control over the palette of external materials, it is my conclusion that the proposal would have no harmful impact on the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building.

7. The Council has suggested that there would be a harmful impact on the setting of the listed building as a result of the proposal. I agree that the extension proposed would figure prominently in some views of the building. However, as set out above, it would be read as a subtly-linked, subservient addition and as a result, I do not consider that the union between the contemporary extension and the vernacular farmhouse would be an unhappy one.

8. Bringing those points together, I am content that the proposal does not fall foul of s.16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. On top of that, it would accord with Policies DM07 and ST15 of the North Devon and Torridge Local Plan 2011-2031 which support proposals that conserve heritage assets, and the approach to designated heritage assets set out in paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. For all those reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Paul Griffiths

INSPECTOR