



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 3 December 2019

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th December 2019

Appeal A Ref: APP/E2530/W/19/3222691

24 St Leonards Street, Stamford, Lincs PE9 2HL

- 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 Alex Way against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref S18/1753, dated 18 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is extension and alterations to dwelling.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/E2530/Y/19/3222688

24 St Leonards Street, Stamford, Lincs PE9 2HL

- 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 Alex Way against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref S18/2017, dated 18 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2019.
 - The works proposed are the same as Appeal A.
-

Decisions

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue for both appeals is whether the proposal would preserve the special interest of the listed building at 24 St Leonards Street and the character and appearance of Stamford Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is listed Grade II and forms part of a single listed building entry at 22, 23 and 24 St Leonards Street. This single storey row of properties with habitable roof space dates from the late 17th or early 18th century. The properties are built from coursed rubble with a Collyweston slate roof. Each has two front dormers at roof level which in the case of No 24 are in need of some repair. At the rear, Nos 23 and 24 have a single storey lean-to extension of similar depth, while the main roof slope is unaltered and windowless. No 22 has a two storey rear gable extension at the same ridge height as the main roof with an additional single storey lean-to extension. The two storey element is a similar depth to the extensions at Nos 23 and 24. The properties are located within Stamford Conservation Area, which covers the town's historic core and contains a wealth of historic buildings and spaces. St Leonards Street has a series of historic stone and brick properties of varying styles and sizes.

4. The special interest of the listed row of properties is informed by their modest size and their use of simple architectural details and materials. They form a coherent and attractive part of St Leonards Street and so make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Although the rear elevation has been more altered with extensions, the modest and simple historic form is retained at Nos 23 and 24 in particular. The lack of public visibility of the rear elevation does not diminish its contribution to the significance of the listed building and the conservation area.
5. The proposal would result in a two storey extension more than double the depth of the existing single storey extension and would more than double the footprint and floorspace of the main historic property. It would project further rearwards than the two storey extension at No 22 regardless of whether that extension was built without consent. Although the adjoining property at No 25 has a two storey rear projection of similar depth to the proposal, it is a separate building of different size and height and so does not set a precedent. The proposed ridge height would step down from the main ridge, but the size and scale of the extension would not be subservient to the existing property. Moreover, the half hipped end to the roof would not reflect the simplicity of roof form and would look awkward.
6. There would be a large amount of glazing on both floors of the rear elevation which would appear too modern and intrusive on a modest historic property. The remaining parts of the lean-to either side of the two storey extension would be retained and the roof pitch raised. On its own it would not be much different from the existing lean-to with little change to the footprint, but in combination with the two storey extension it would add to the overly large and bulky additions at the rear.
7. The proposal would result in harm to the significance of the listed building and the conservation area due to its size, scale and design. The harm would be less than substantial but still significant given the impact of the proposal on the listed building and conservation area. Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires such harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
8. The proposal would result in the repair of the existing roof, including mock Collyweston slates, and the replacement of the dormer windows. However, it has not been demonstrated that the dormers or roof slates require wholesale replacement to justify the loss of historic fabric. As such, I give little weight to this part of the proposal as a public benefit. The extension would utilise sympathetic materials but this could be achieved on a less harmful proposal. Additional living space would be provided for a property with limited floor space particularly in the roof. However, this would appear to represent a private benefit only. Therefore, there are no public benefits that would outweigh the harm to the listed building and the conservation area.
9. In conclusion, the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building or the character and appearance of Stamford Conservation Area. Consequently, there would be conflict with Policy EN1 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy 2010 which requires development to protect and enhance the character of the district include historic features. The proposal would also harm the significance of designated heritage assets without adequate public benefits and so would be contrary to the NPPF.

Other Matters

10. I note the support from occupiers of neighbouring properties towards the proposal and the discussions between the appellant and the Council including potential alternative approaches to the rear extension. However, based on the assessment of the proposal before me, this does not alter my overall findings.

Conclusions

11. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge

INSPECTOR