
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2019

by H Porter BA(Hons) MSc Dip IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/Y/19/3227489

30 High Street Burbage SN8 3AF

- 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 Richard Outhwaite against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 18/06056/LBC, dated 6 June 2018, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2018.
 - The works proposed are single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are whether the proposed works would preserve the Grade II listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses; and whether the character and appearance of the Burbage Conservation Area would be preserved or enhanced.

Reasons

3. Number 30 High Street, together with its attached neighbour at Number 32, is a Grade II listed building in the Burbage Conservation Area (CA). The statutory list description identifies it as two cottages, roughcast on brickwork with a thatched roof; the north cottage, the appeal building, being the earlier of the two. The building likely dates from the 18th century. Although it has been adapted over time, it still retains the charm and appearance of a vernacular cottage of that period. The significance and special interest of the listed building therefore lie in its preservation of the authentic qualities of a modest thatch and timber-framed dwelling. The building's overall form, layout, surviving historic fabric and degree of historic integrity are therefore aspects that underpin that special interest.
4. The appeal building is prominently sited on High Street, the central spine through the linear village. The well-preserved qualities and integrity of the appeal building provide a link with the area's earliest built development. As such it contributes aesthetically and historically to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole and to its significance as a designated heritage asset.
5. A c. early 20th century brick-built lean-to runs the length of the building and cuts in just under the eaves of the thatched roof. A second, later, brick and glazed lean-to extends rearwards from one end. Although of no obvious

architectural merit, the rear additions are low-key and unobtrusive. While the second extension has created an L-shaped footprint, its size and position at one end of the building mean that the original flat-backed form, linear dimensions and line of the thatch remain legible.

6. The appeal scheme proposes a brick flat-roofed extension to the building's rear, which would include bi-fold doors and a roof lantern. The proposed extension would occupy almost half the width of the appeal building and create one room that would be as large as any within the principal building. There would consequently be a substantial increase in the footprint of the new works in relation to the original extent of the listed building. Moreover, taken together with the existing entrance extension, the proposal would create an awkward stepping in and out on the building's rear elevation. Although the proposed works would not affect historic fabric, overall, the proposed extension would erode legibility of the building's original linear form and its modest proportions, which would cause harm.
7. There is no objection to the principle of a rear extension and I appreciate that the current iteration has sought to overcome the Council's concerns with an earlier pitched roof design. That said, the proposed bi-fold doors and roof lantern would be unrelated to the pattern of fenestration elsewhere in the cottage. Additionally, the lantern would reach just above the eaves of the thatched roof, emphasising it as an uncharacteristic and incongruous feature.
8. Fundamentally, the appeal scheme would have an uncomfortable relationship with the appeal building and would fail to preserve the listed building or its features of special architectural or historic interest. It follows that if the special interest of a listed building within a conservation area, prominently located such as in this case, is materially diminished, then the character and appearance of the CA as a whole is similarly, incrementally harmed.
9. The significance of the listed building and CA as heritage assets would be harmed. The magnitude of that harm would be less than substantial, within the meaning of the term in the National Planning Policy Framework, Revised February 2019 (Framework). In the circumstances, the less than substantial harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
10. The appeal building is small, however, there is no suggestion that the proposed works would be necessary to secure the building's optimum viable use. Rather, the proposal would provide larger internal living space, which would satisfy the private wants and wishes of the appellant. There would be some short-term economic benefits associated with the construction phase. Ultimately, however, the works would be of very limited wider public benefit. The overarching statutory duties must be given considerable importance and weight; on balance, the public benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the material harm to the designated heritage assets.
11. The proposed works thereby run contrary to the clear expectations of Sections 16(2), 66(1) and Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to Section 72(1) of the Act. There would also be conflict with the historic environment policies of the Framework; and with policies 57 and 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, January 2015, insofar as these seek to ensure proposals are sympathetic to and conserve historic

buildings and protect, conserve and where possible enhance the historic environment.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

H Porter

INSPECTOR