



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 27 January 2021

by Nigel Harrison BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 January 2021

Appeal A: Ref: APP/J3720/W/20/3258023

Flowers Cottage, Main Street, Farnborough, Oxfordshire, OX17 1DZ

- 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 and Mrs Gordon Bott against the decision of Stratford on Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref: 20/01205/FUL dated 7 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is: Extension to existing lean-to; insertion of 2 No small roof lights (eastern facing roof pitch) (retrospective); and internal alterations.
-

Appeal B: Ref: APP/J3720/Y/20/3258022

Flowers Cottage, Main Street, Farnborough, Oxfordshire, OX17 1DZ

- 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 and Mrs Gordon Bott against the decision of Stratford on Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref: 20/01206/LBC dated 7 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2020.
 - The works proposed are: Extension to existing lean-to; insertion of 2 No small roof lights (eastern facing roof pitch) (retrospective); and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. **Appeal A** is allowed, and planning permission is granted for: Extension to existing lean-to; insertion of 2 No small roof lights (eastern facing roof pitch); and internal alterations at Flowers Cottage, Main Street, Farnborough, Oxfordshire, OX17 1DZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: Ref: 20/01205/FUL dated 7 May 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No 5430.02 Rev B Proposed Site Plan; Drawing No 5430.04 Rev B proposed Floor Plans; Drawing No 5430.05 Proposed Elevations; and Drawing No 5430.06 Detail Plan and Section Through Extension.
2. **Appeal B** is allowed and listed building consent is granted for: Extension to existing lean-to; insertion of 2 No small roof lights (eastern facing roof pitch); and internal alterations at Flowers Cottage, Main Street, Farnborough,

Oxfordshire, OX17 1DZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: Ref: 20/01205/FUL, dated 7 May 2021, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The works hereby authorised shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
- 2) The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No 5430.02 Rev B Proposed Site Plan; Drawing No 5430.04 Rev B proposed Floor Plans; Drawing No 5430.05 Proposed Elevations; and Drawing No 5430.06 Detail Plan and Section Through Extension.

Main Issue

3. The one main issue is the effect of the proposed development/works on the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building, and on the character and appearance of the Farnborough Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. Flowers Cottage is a Grade II listed building within close proximity of a number of other Grade II and II* listed buildings within the Farnborough Conservation Area.
5. The proposal comprises two elements. 1) A single-storey extension to the existing lean-to at the side of the building. This would include three small rooflights in the roof slope and involves removal of a section of the original end gable wall in order to 'open up' the kitchen. 2) The insertion of two conservation style rooflights in the east facing (rear) roof slope. This part of the proposal is retrospective, as these rooflights have been installed.
6. Although not included within the reasons for refusal, the Council's delegated report says these rooflights in the east-facing roof slope would be acceptable. Further to my own observations, I am also satisfied that this particular element of the scheme would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the conservation area.
7. At the statutory level, Sections 16 (2) & 66 (1) of the *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990* require the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. As the site lies within a conservation area, I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area, in accordance with Section 72 (1) of The Act.
8. Policy CS8 of the *Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy 2011-2031* (CS) seeks to protect the historic environment. It reflects the statutory duty in the Act and national policy for the historic environment in the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework).
9. The dwelling has been altered and extended in recent times, but the significance of the building rests essentially in its simple form, scale, proportions, and traditional construction, which are characteristic of the local vernacular tradition.
10. The proposed extension is small in scale and traditional in construction. It would be unobtrusive and would read visually as being very much subservient

to the main dwelling. There would be some loss of historic fabric in that a section of end gable wall would be removed, although this would be modest and not significantly harmful in my view. An existing external doorway would be obscured by the extension, but its reveal would be retained on one side. I am also satisfied that the historic plan form and character of the building would not be compromised, particularly given that the historic plan form has already been lost when the building was stripped out internally in 1986, and by the extension to the building in 2011.

11. Whilst the proposed rooflights to the extension would be visible from the street, they are modest in dimensions and well proportioned. As such I do not find that they would lead to a cluttered effect on the roof slope.
12. Paragraph 193 of the Revised *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) says when considering the impact of new development on the significance of a listed building, great weight should be given to its conservation. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Paragraph 196 says where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
13. Taking all the above matters together, I consider the proposal represents an acceptable design solution that would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, causing no harm to its significance. For the same reasons the proposal would have a neutral effect that would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. Therefore, the question of public benefits to outweigh any harm does not arise. I find no conflict with CS Policy CS8 and the policies of the Framework.

Other Matter

14. The site lies within the Ironstone Hill Special Landscape Area. However, there would be no detrimental impact on the character of the SLA and the proposal would not conflict with CS Policy CS12.

Conclusion

15. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and taking into account all other representations raised, I conclude that both appeals should be allowed.
16. The Council has not put forward any suggested conditions. However, I have considered the advice on conditions in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Conditions are needed for both appeals to secure compliance with the submitted plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Nigel Harrison

INSPECTOR