
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 3 December 2019

by Anne Jordan BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 December 2019

Appeal A

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/W/19/3232481

Ivy Cottage, Willen Road, Milton Keynes Village, Milton Keynes, MK10 9AF

- 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 & Mrs D Adams against the decision of Milton Keynes Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00674/FUL, dated 14 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of single-storey lean-to extension and construction of a family room, rear porch and boot-room as a single storey extension in the back garden.
-

Appeal B

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/W/19/3232488

Ivy Cottage, Willen Road, Milton Keynes Village, Milton Keynes, MK10 9AF

- 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 D Adams against the decision of Milton Keynes Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00675/LBC, dated 14 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2019.
 - The works proposed are demolition of single-storey lean-to extension and construction of a family room, rear porch and boot-room as a single storey extension in the back garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The original application included the removal of an internal wall between the lounge and family room. This element of the proposal has been removed and so I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues for both appeals are the impact of the proposals on the special architectural and historic interest of this Grade II listed building known as Ivy Cottage and the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Milton Keynes Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. S16(2) and S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic

interest which it possesses. S72(1) of the Act requires special attention to be had to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area. Policy HE1 of Plan:MK 2016-2031 seeks to sustain and enhance the significance of designated heritage assets through the development process and this reflects the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) and the requirements of the Act.

5. Ivy Cottage is a Grade II Listed 17th Century cottage which has been altered over time. It is timber framed with colourwashed brick infill and a thatched roof and sits within a relatively large plot. It sits on the roadside and in views into the site the traditional appearance of the building contributes to the varied street scene. The significance of the asset is derived from its importance as an surviving example of a building of its type, and in the contribution it makes to the character of the surrounding area.
6. The proposal comprises the demolition of an existing brick built extension and the erection of a single storey, flat-roofed extension to the rear of the property. A timber barn would also be removed from the rear garden to facilitate the extension. The contemporary appearance of the extension would clearly distinguish it from the original dwelling. A flat cantilever roof, large amounts of glazing, a porthole window and vertical timber boarding would all provide a stark contrast with the traditional form of the thatched cottage behind.
7. I see nothing wrong with a contemporary approach in principle, and note the examples given elsewhere where such an approach has been employed. However, in this case, due to its size, and the degree to which the uncompromising form of the addition is connected to the original building, the proposal would both fail to either assimilate with the older fabric or to provide sufficient separation between the old and the new for the contrasting approach not to overwhelm the host building. This is particularly evident on the eastern façade where the incongruously modern profile of the roof, the relatively bulky footprint and the contemporary glazing would together jar uncomfortably with the form and proportions of Ivy Cottage and appear visually distracting and intrusive.
8. The extension would be positioned away from the road and so only limited public views would be available of the addition. Nevertheless in private views of the asset, in the rear garden, and in limited views into the site from the north and south, the proposal would harm the appearance of the building. As this contributes to the building's significance, the proposal would also lead to harm to the significance of the listed building as a heritage asset. The proposal would also harm the character of the Conservation Area, although as this would relate to a very small part of the Conservation Area, and in limited public views this harm would also be relatively limited.
9. The harm identified would amount to "less than substantial harm" which the Framework advises must be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme. The proposal would not lead to a loss of original fabric, as the single storey extension that would be removed is a later addition but this is a neutral factor which does not weigh in favour of the scheme. I do not accept the appellant's view, that the removal of the existing extension or other buildings within the setting of the asset would represent a benefit. The existing addition is modest in scale and sits comfortably on the eastern elevation and as such has very little impact upon the appearance of the asset and the existing barns, whilst in

need of some repair, do not have any significant impact on the appreciation of Ivy Cottage as a heritage asset.

10. The proposal would provide additional living accommodation for the family who occupy the dwelling. This would lead to a small improvement to the housing stock, but as I have no convincing evidence that the dwelling at present provides substandard or inadequate accommodation, I attribute very little weight to this matter as a public benefit.
11. The Framework is clear that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and that in considering the impact of development on the significance of heritage assets great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. I therefore attribute greater weight to the harm which would arise to the significance of the asset as a result of this proposal and accordingly the benefits identified would be insufficient to outweigh this harm. It follows that the proposal fails to comply with national policy outlined in the Framework and with local policy HE1 of Plan:MK outlined above.
12. Accordingly, for the reasons outlined above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR