
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 19 August 2020

by Mr JP Sargent BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 September 2020

Appeal A: APP/J3720/Y/3251222

Sykes House, Queen Street, Halford CV36 5BT

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr I Sloan against the decision of Stratford on Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02520/LBC, dated 5 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2019.
 - The works proposed are emergency works to barn roof to include 3 dormer windows.
-

Appeal B: APP/J3720/W/3251227

Sykes House, Queen Street, Halford CV36 5BT

- 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 I Sloan against the decision of Stratford on Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02519/FUL, dated 5 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is emergency works to barn roof to include 3 dormer windows.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue with these appeals is whether the works preserve the special architectural or historic interest of this listed building, whether they fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Halford Conservation Area, and their impact on the significance of these 2 designated heritage assets.

Reasons

4. The character and appearance of the Halford Conservation Area illustrate the slow evolution over time of this historic rural settlement. This is primarily apparent in the layout of the village, and the way many of the buildings are of a simple traditional design and built from materials that are typical of the wider area. Moreover, a significant number of the dwellings have ancillary buildings

adjacent that, because of their functional nature, reflect former links to agriculture. Such factors add to the significance of the conservation area.

5. Sykes House, which is Grade II listed (and referred to as just Sykes in the listing description), was previously a farmhouse. A way in which this is apparent is by the outbuildings to the rear creating a courtyard and, through their arrangement and design, still illustrating the rural origins of the property. One of these outbuildings, which is described as a barn on the application forms, is the subject of these appeals, and under section 1(5) of the Act it is to be treated as part of the listed building. It is 2 storeys in height with its upper floor in the roof space and, before the works were undertaken, I anticipate that its external appearance and its architectural style strongly demonstrated its earlier agricultural role. As such, although it is not listed in its own right or specifically mentioned in the listing description for Sykes House it very much added to the special architectural and historic interest of the site and contributed positively to its significance. By extension, it also enhanced the character and appearance of the conservation area.
6. The works before me have now been undertaken and comprise 2 elements. Firstly, a roof from around 1998 that had been laid over the original rafters of the barn has been replaced for structural reasons, and secondly 3 dormer windows have been inserted into the elevation facing the house.
7. Given the retrospective nature of the case, I am unable to see precisely what fabric has been removed. However, on the evidence before me and my observations on site, I am satisfied that the works have principally affected the relatively modern 1990s roof structure, with none of the older historic fabric beneath being lost. Accordingly, I consider no harm to the significance of the building has arisen from its re-roofing.
8. Turning to the dormer windows, I understand these have been inserted into what were existing openings and involved the loss of no historic fabric. However, they are very much domestic in nature by reason of their size and their extensive lead surrounds - indeed, they were purposefully designed to match those on the principal dwelling. As such, they dilute the historic relationship between this former agricultural outbuilding and the main house, disrupting the hierarchy of built form on the site. They therefore fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, causing harm, albeit less than substantial, to its significance and the significance of the conservation area. This concern would remain even if I treated the outbuilding as being a former stable, as the appellant is now contending.
9. The appellant has expressed a willingness to replace the dormer windows with rooflights. However, I have no details of such features before me or the implications of a change of this nature, and so cannot consider them acceptable at this stage.
10. As I have found that the dormer windows cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the building and the conservation area then, under the *National Planning Policy Framework*, this needs to be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme. I have not been told that these dormer windows are necessary to enable the use of the building to continue or to allow the re-roofing to take place, and indeed they add relatively little to the barn's useable

floor area. Mindful of this I am aware of no such public benefits existing to outweigh this harm.

11. Moreover, if some historic fabric has in fact been lost because of the removal of the 1990s roofing, I anticipate it would have been relatively minor in extent but accept that some less than substantial harm might have resulted as a consequence. However, on the evidence before me I have no reason to question that, if such fabric was lost, it was to ensure repairs were undertaken that were necessary for the preservation of the barn, and so the public benefit of safeguarding this historic building outweighs any such harm.
12. Accordingly, I conclude that the dormer windows, because of their domestic character and their effect on the built hierarchy on the site, fail to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of this building and do not preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area, causing less than substantial harm to the significance of both of these designated heritage assets. In the absence of any public benefits to outweigh this harm, I therefore find the works conflict with Policy CS.8 in the *Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy*, which broadly seeks to ensure development respects the historic environment, and guidance in the *National Planning Policy Framework*. The appeals are therefore dismissed.

JP Sargent

INSPECTOR