



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2020

by Anne Jordan BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4th June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/Y/20/3246060

Carpenters Cottage, Main Street, Winster, DE4 2DJ

- 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 Chris Payne against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/DDD/1119/1233, dated 22 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 January 2020.
 - The works proposed are described as "block up one of the two front doors of the house using limestone rubble and lime mortar, replace a small area of floor tiles with stone flagstones and install an extractor fan in the bathroom."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the works to block up one of the two front doors of the house using limestone rubble and lime mortar.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to replacing a small area of floor tiles with stone flagstones and installing an extractor fan in the bathroom at Carpenters Cottage, Main Street, Winster, DE4 2DJ in accordance with the terms of the application ref NP/DDD/1119/1233, dated 22 November 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) Prior to the commencement of the works details of the proposed flooring flagstones shall be submitted for approval to the local planning authority. The works shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved details.
 - 3) The installation of the flue shall be implemented in accordance with the details contained within the submitted heritage statement, dated 3 December 2019.

Main Issue

3. The main issue for the appeal is whether the proposals would preserve the special interest of the Grade II Carpenters Cottage and any special interest the building possesses, and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Winster 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. GSP3 and L3 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy and Policies DMC3 and DMC7 of the Development Management Policies 2019 reflect the statutory duty set out in the Act.
5. Carpenters Cottage is a Grade II listed building which lies within the Winster Conservation Area. It is described in the listing as a pair of houses, although the floorplan indicates that the building was used internally as a single unit and it is thought that it may have at some time been used as a house and shop. The western doorway opens directly into a large room. The eastern doorway would originally have opened into a semi-enclosed hallway, which provided internal access to both sides of the property. The 2 separate entrances, which are framed by stone quoins, form part of a largely symmetrical spacing of openings to the frontage which gives the building a pleasingly regular character. The significance of the asset lies in its status as a surviving example of a building of its age and type, and in the contribution the appearance of the "pair" makes to the surrounding area, including the character of this part of the Winster Conservation Area.
6. The proposal comprises 3 separate elements - the installation of an extraction fan on the rear elevation of the single storey outrigger to the property, the replacement of floor tiles within the property, and the blocking up of a doorway in the front elevation. I will deal with these in turn below.

Blocking up of doorway

7. The submitted plans show the eastern doorway blocked up by a limestone rubble and lime mortar "wall". I noted during the site visit that a similar treatment has been employed on a number of properties in the village. In some cases these works have assimilated over time in the streetscene and in others their presence forms an anomalous feature, which although characterful, is nonetheless notable because of the degree to which the alteration distorts the rhythm of openings on the original building. In this regard such changes are clearly alterations to the original fabric which do not always preserve the special interest of the building. In this case, even with the retention of the original stone quoins the alteration would significantly alter the appearance of the front elevation. It would distort the regular pattern of solid to void which is a defining characteristic of the building's appearance. As a result the works would appear intrusive and mar the balanced appearance of the building. I therefore consider that the works would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that in such cases harm to a heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme. The proposal would allow some limited benefits by way of improving the usability of the internal space within. However, I see no reason why such benefits could not be achieved by a means which preserves the appearance of the front elevation. I also do not accept that such works would

appear false or that the retention of the door would be unduly burdensome in terms of maintenance.

9. 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 Carpenters Cottage as a result of this proposal and accordingly the benefits identified would be insufficient to outweigh this harm. It therefore follows that the proposal fails to comply with national policy outlined in the Framework and conflicts with policies GSP3 and L3 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy and Policy DMC7 of the Development Management Policies 2019 (DMP), which together seek to preserve the character and appearance of Listed Buildings and to ensure that new development does not result in the loss of features which contribute to the architectural or historic interest of the building. Insofar as the proposal would harm the appearance of the listed building and would be highly visible in the streetscene, it would also cause harm to the appearance and character of the Winster Conservation Area, and so would also conflict with the Framework and with Policy DMC5 of the DMP.

Installation of the extraction fan and removal of floor tiles

10. The proposed flue would be located to the centre of the rear gable on the single storey rear outrigger. It would be fitted with a cast iron cowl. The Council have no objection to either the appearance of the works or the removal of fabric from the building. The cowl would be a relatively small cast iron fitting which would be painted black, and so would assimilate comfortably within the rear elevation. It would also involve only a minimal removal of building fabric. I therefore see no reason to dispute the Council's view, that this element of the proposal would not cause harm to the significance of the grade II listed building, or have a significant impact on the wider landscape character and the Conservation Area.
11. The tiles proposed for removal are a small area of Edwardian style floor tiles located on the threshold of the eastern doorway to Main Street. The tiles indicate that the doorway was previously considered to be the main entrance. However, I noted on site that the adjoining wall had been partly removed and that the tiles no longer covered what would have been an enclosed area. They were in a poor state of repair and covered a small part of the floor area of the room. When viewed in the context of the current space, they no longer served their original function and appeared as an overly ornate intrusion within the room. Furthermore, I have no indication that the use of the doorway as a main door, as opposed to an "everyday" entrance, is an aspect of the building's use which was or remains an important aspect of the building's character, or history. In this context the contribution the feature makes to the significance of the asset is very limited and its removal would have a broadly neutral effect on that significance.
12. I therefore find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which seeks to preserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. The works would therefore not conflict with Policies GSP3 and L3 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy and Policies DMC3 and DMC7 of the Development Management Policies 2019. Together, amongst other things, these seek to protect, conserve and enhance the setting of

heritage assets and so have similar aims to the Framework and I find no conflict with these.

Conclusion

13. The blocking up of the doorway would harm the significance if the Grade II Listed Carpenters Cottage. It would also harm the Character of the Winster Conservation Area. The stated benefits of the scheme would be insufficient to outweigh the harm identified. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, this aspect of the appeal is dismissed.
14. The removal of the tiles and installation of an extraction fan would not cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset. Accordingly these parts of the appeal are allowed. I have considered the proposed conditions in light of the advice in Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to conditions relating to approved plans and the period of implementation, In order that an appropriate finish is provided for the tiled area I consider it necessary for details of the proposed flooring flagstones to be provided for approval and have imposed a condition in that regard.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR