
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 27 January 2020

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th February 2020

Appeal A Ref: APP/P2114/W/19/3233233

June Cottage, Main Road, Wellow, Yarmouth, Isle of Wight, PO41 0SZ.

- 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 K. Fisher against the decision of the Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00114/HOU, dated 17 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of conservatory and porch: new single storey extension.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/P2114/Y/19/3233241

June Cottage, Main Road, Wellow, Yarmouth, Isle of Wight, PO41 0SZ.

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed buildings consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr K. Fisher against the decision of the Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00115/LBC, dated 17 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2019.
 - The works proposed are demolition of conservatory and porch: new single storey extension.
-

Decisions

Appeal A Ref: APP/P2114/W/19/3233233

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B Ref: APP/P2114/Y/19/3233241

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. I consider that there is one main issue in this case and that is whether the proposed works would serve to preserve the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Reasons

4. June Cottage is a detached dwelling, dating from the 18 century, listed Grade II. It is constructed of stone rubble with a barn hip thatched roof. The cottage, which has later single storey extensions at either end, including a conservatory addition to the rear, sits gable end on to the road, similar to other nearby dwellings. Save for a small porch it is linear in plan form and occupies a narrow and generally linear shaped plot.
-

5. Neither party has submitted any evidence as to its significance. However, in my judgement the significance of the asset lies in its aesthetic value as a surviving example of 18 Century vernacular architecture, in its evidential value of remaining historic fabric and in the contribution the building makes to the character of the wider area.
6. The appellant proposes the demolition of the porch and conservatory replacing them with a single storey 'L' shaped extension that would wrap around the north-east corner of the cottage.
7. Both the existing porch and conservatory are dilapidated utilitarian structures and their removal is to be welcomed. However, the proposed extension would, I understand from the evidence before me, project some 3.0 meters or so in front of the main façade (east elevation) of the cottage. The roof over this projection would also, in contrast to the simple form of the roof of the cottage, comprise a contrasting and somewhat fussy double hip roof and valley
8. The proposed 'L' shaped extension and double hipped roof would, by reason of its projection to the east of the cottage, the overall mass of the extension and its complex roof form denude the simple linear form of the original cottage as reinforced by the later additions to the front and rear elevations.
9. Accordingly, in my judgement, for this reason the extension would appear as an awkward alien addition that would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of this heritage asset and so harm its significance.
10. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, which include listed buildings. It draws a distinction between substantial harm and less than substantial harm to such an asset. For the latter, which applies here, the test is that the harm should be weighed against public benefits, including securing the optimum viable use.
11. The proposed extension would serve to ensure that the listed building remains relevant to family occupation of the dwelling and therefore its use for day-to-day living. This is clearly a public benefit. However, this benefit is plainly not wholly reliant on the proposed addition and so I attribute this benefit limited weight in this case. Given the extent of harm that has been identified I conclude that the public benefits would not outweigh this harm, and so the proposal would fail to comply with the Framework. It would also conflict with Policies DM2 and DM11 of the Island Plan – *Isle of Wight Core Strategy* (March 2012). All as they relate to the duties imposed by sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 in respect of the desirability of preserving listed buildings or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest, which it possesses.

Other matters

12. The Council had a further reason for refusal of the Section 78 planning application and that was: *The layout and siting of the proposed development would result in the loss of two trees which are considered to contribute to the public amenity of the area. Insufficient information has been provided on how the impact of this loss would be mitigated.*
13. However, as I observed on the occasion of my visit the two trees in question had already been cut down to ground level. From the evidence before me I am

unable to determine whether the two trees were protected by a tree preservation order or not. Nevertheless, given my views in relation to the harm that would arise to the significance of the listed building, this matter does not alter my conclusions in any case.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeals should fail.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR