



---

## Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 10 March 2020

**by H Porter BA(Hons) MScDip IHBC**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 13 March 2020**

---

### **Appeal A Ref: APP/U3935/W/19/3228903**

#### **Poveys Cottage, Tuckers Lane, Hinton Parva, Swindon SN4 0DW**

- 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 David Clark against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
  - The application Ref S/HOU/18/1830/SASM, dated 9 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2019.
  - The development proposed is rear and side extensions and internal alterations.
- 

### **Appeal B Ref: APP/U3935/W/19/3228721**

#### **Poveys Cottage, Tuckers Lane, Hinton Parva, Swindon SN4 0DW**

- 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 David Clark against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
  - The application Ref S/LBC/18/1831/SASM, dated 9 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2019.
  - The works proposed are rear and side extensions and internal alterations.
- 

## **Decisions**

1. Appeal A is dismissed. Appeal B is dismissed.

## **Procedural matter**

2. Revised plans (02\_008B and 02\_010A) have been submitted with the appeals, which omit an external path around the perimeter of the building. As the proposals have not been materially changed, I have considered the appeals in light of the revised plans and do not consider the Council or interested parties would be prejudiced by my doing so.

## **Main Issues**

3. The main issues in both appeals are whether the proposed works and development would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building known as Povey's Cottage; and, whether the character and appearance of the Hinton Parva Conservation Area would be preserved or enhanced.

## **Reasons – both appeals**

4. Povey's Cottage is a detached Grade II listed building situated within the Hinton Parva Conservation Area (CA). The statutory list description identifies Povey's Cottage as probably dating from the 18<sup>th</sup> century, a one-and-a-half-

storey thatched cottage with hipped roof containing two small eyebrow dormers, constructed of painted chalk rubble and brick, with an L-shaped footprint.

5. Despite changes over time, including a two-storey extension to the north/south range, the integrity of the historic extent of Povey's Cottage and its authenticity as a traditional thatched cottage remains legible. The overall manner of the building's execution, including a softly-moulded thatch and decorative ridge, and local materials, defines Povey's Cottage as an attractive, historic dwelling typical of the local vernacular; these being the features that underpin the listed building's significance and special interest.
6. Povey's Cottage is prominently sited, fronting Tucker's Lane, which runs through the centre of the small rural settlement of Hinton Parva. In terms of its age, materials and form, Povey's Cottage is one of the historic buildings of traditional construction that characterises the CA<sup>1</sup>. As such, the appeal site contributes aesthetically and historically to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole, and thereby to its significance as a designated heritage asset.
7. The proposal is to add a two-storey extension with a clay tile roof, timber boarding and joinery, off the building's c. 1960s gable end; as well as a single-storey side extension with zinc roof and timber boarding. It is also proposed to re-clad the roof of a small utility extension in zinc.
8. The proposals would not affect any historic fabric, and the two-storey element would step down slightly from the ridge of the principal building. Even so, there would be an awkward relationship between the form and materials of the new extension, particularly at roof-level. Notably, the pitch and shape of the existing thatch would be realigned, while the extension would introduce a solidity and rigidity incongruous with the informal qualities of the traditional thatch.
9. While noting an intention to draw a distinction between the original dwelling and the proposals, the variety in fenestration, roof pitches, projections and materials would fail to complement the homogeneity of the existing building. Furthermore, the dark-stained horizontal timbers and clay tiles would evoke barn-like qualities and contrived additions. Ultimately, the proposals would lack cohesion and dilute the building's consistency, while the extent to which the building is distinguished by its thatched roof would be incrementally, and harmfully, lessened.
10. The scale of the proposed extensions would be relatively modest compared to the existing floor area and plot size. The two-storey extension would add bulk and while the side extension would erode the building's L-shaped footprint as well as the extent undeveloped space around it. Taken together with the extensions to date, the appeal proposals would add substantially to Povey's Cottage and weaken the authenticity of its simple, modest form.
11. Fundamentally, the appeal proposals would be at odds with the character of this simple, vernacular building and would fail to preserve the listed building or its features of special architectural or historic interest. In turn, the contribution Povey's Cottage makes to the architectural and historic interest of the CA

---

<sup>1</sup> Hinton Parva Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, 2006 p.8

would be diminished, albeit in a small way. The character and appearance of the CA as a whole would therefore not be preserved but incrementally harmed.

12. The degree of harm to the listed building and CA would be less than substantial. However, the proposals would not demonstrably secure the optimum use of the building, which is already in use as a single-family dwelling. Even if no additional bedrooms are proposed, the convenience afforded by additional living space, outlook and improved circulation would be of personal advantage. Any improvement in thermal efficiency or solar gains could, conceivably, be achieved in less harmful ways. Even taking account of the economic benefits associated with the construction phase, the sum of public benefits does not outweigh the material harm to the designated heritage assets.

### **Conclusion – both appeals**

13. The proposed works thereby run contrary to the clear expectations of Sections 66(1) and Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. There would also be conflict with the historic environment policies of the Framework; and with policies DE1 and EN10 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026, adopted March 2015. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure proposals are of high-quality design, including in respect of context and character, and seek to conserve and enhance the significance, character or appearance of the historic environment.
14. Whether or not there has been any objection from the Parish Council, or limited reference to the appeal building in the Conservation Area Appraisal, the overarching statutory duties to preserve listed buildings and conservation areas must be given considerable importance and weight. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

*H Porter*

INSPECTOR