



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2019

by Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W3520/Y/18/3218444

Stotts Cottage, 2 Cross Street, Drinkstone IP30 9TP

- 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 Stebbing against the decision of Mid Suffolk District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/18/03905, dated 29 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 29 October 2018.
 - The works proposed are the introduction of two conservation roof windows into the rear elevation of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for the introduction of two conservation roof windows into the rear elevation of the property at Stotts Cottage, 2 Cross Street, Drinkstone IP30 9TP in accordance with the terms of the application Ref DC/18/03905 dated 29 August 2018 and the plans submitted with it subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
 - 2) Prior to the commencement of the works, full manufacturer details of the roof windows shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall be implemented in line with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed works would preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed building known as Stott Cottages, 1 and 2, Cross Street.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is listed Grade II and forms one half of the listed building entry known as Stott Cottages, 1 and 2, Cross Street. The semi-detached pair of cottages date from the 16th century and originated as one house according to the list description. The cottages are timber framed and plastered with a tall timber shingled roof. Internally, the appeal building contains a number of small rooms with historic timbers and brick fireplaces. There is uniformity between the two cottages, particularly at the front where the roof slope is wholly unbroken and there is little in the way of modern alterations and additions. These architectural and historic features contribute greatly to the special interest of the listed building as well as its significance.

4. The lack of public visibility of the rear elevation does not in itself diminish the contribution it makes to the special interest and significance of the listed building. The rear elevation of the cottages has been subject to various alterations with single storey rear extensions at the adjoining cottage. The appeal building previously had a flat roofed two storey extension or box dormer that cut into the lower portion of the roof slope, as well as a mono-pitch single storey extension.
5. Approval was given in 2018 for various works to the appeal building including a two storey rear extension with gable roof that projects from the roof slope just below the chimney. The extension and other elements were under construction at my site visit. As a consequence, the rear roof slope is not unbroken like the front and the uniformity between the two cottages is less apparent. This lessens the contribution of the rear elevation to the special interest and significance of the listed building.
6. The proposed works would result in two small conservation roof windows set between existing rafters on the rear roof slope. Although the roof slope has no windows at present, they would be modest additions compared to the new gable roof and would not greatly affect the lack of balance that already exists at the rear. Moreover, their size and siting would not be very conspicuous or harmful to the character and appearance of the listed building.
7. I note a nearby appeal decision¹ where the Inspector dismissed an appeal for listed building consent partly due to the impact of roof windows on the unbroken line of the existing roof. However, it does not appear that the circumstances there were identical to this appeal, including the extent of existing additions to the listed building. As such, I have determined this appeal on its own merits based on the evidence before me.
8. In conclusion, the proposed works would preserve the special interest of the listed building in line with Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. They would also sustain the significance of the listed building in accordance with paragraph 192 of the National Planning Policy Framework. In coming to this conclusion, I have had regard to Policies HB1 and HB5 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan 1998 which seek to protect historic buildings.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed. The formal decision above requires the works to be in accordance with the submitted plans (2191.OS, 2191.03B, 2191.06D). In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring details of the windows to be approved in the interests of safeguarding the special interest of the listed building. Although the appellant has indicated the design and specification of the windows, this information does not form part of the formal plans and so would need to be approved before works begin.

Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/W3520/E/13/2200553