
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2021

by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/Y/20/3263645

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/0920/0868, dated 20 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 November 2020.
 - The works proposed are to modify previously approved work to an internal first floor wall between the landing and bedroom and to retain unplastered an interesting old architectural timber member within an adjoining wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted to modify previously approved work to an internal first floor wall between the landing and bedroom and to retain unplastered an interesting old architectural timber member within an adjoining wall at Carpenters Cottage, Main Street, Winster DE4 2DJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: NP/DDD/0920/0868, dated 20 September 2020 and subject to the plans submitted with it subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun within 3 years from the date of this permission.

Preliminary matter

2. As the appeal relates to a listed building consent, I have had special regard to section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the works on the special architectural and historic interest of Carpenters Cottage, a grade II listed building.

Reasons

Significance

4. Carpenters Cottage is a two storey Grade II listed building dating from about the late eighteenth century. It is constructed from rubble limestone with gritstone dressings, quoins, coped east gable and ashlar ridge stacks under a Welsh slate roof. The list description notes that the building is listed for group

value only. Internally at first floor the rooms are small with simple walls which are plastered. The evidence provided by the appellant shows that they were originally constructed from lath and plaster. Downstairs there is a mixture of plastered walls and, in the sitting room, timber panelling on the lower walls. In some places above windows and doorways there is exposed timber.

5. The significance of the listed building, in so far as it relates to these appeals is derived from its architectural and historic interest associated with the retention of original building materials and evidence of methods which help understand its construction.

Works

6. There is no dispute between the parties that the element of the proposed works involving the removal of a very small part of the partition wall to the first floor middle room to facilitate the doorway to be moved would not be harmful to the special architectural and historic interest of the building. I see no reason to disagree, this is a modern wall within the building that contributes little to its significance.
7. The proposed works include the provision of a replacement partition wall to be a part timbered, part recessed shelving screen between the corridor and middle first floor room. It would be 100mm studwork and 10-20mm horizontal oak boarding either side and hit and miss to form open shelves. The Council consider this to be an inappropriate wall covering with the design not in keeping with the listed building.
8. The existing partition wall to be removed and replaced is not original. Its loss is therefore not at issue, and Listed Building Consent has already been granted for a replacement plasterboard partition wall (NP/DDD/0119/0015). While the upstairs walls are relatively simple, given the extent of timber used elsewhere in the property, as well as that approved to enclose the stairs, I am satisfied that its use on this modern partition wall would not be harmful to the significance of the building. The original layout of the building would still be legible, and the historic character retained. Furthermore, historic construction methods and fabric would not be lost or harmed.
9. The final area of the Council's concerns relates to the exposure of a structural beam which it considers inappropriate. At the time of my site visit the works to the wall with the timber member had been completed with the wall plastered save for a very small area where the exposed timber can be seen. The appellant states that repairs to the plaster of the internal walls was granted listed building consent previously, and this has not been disputed by the Council.
10. The appellant suspects that the timber is a remnant of an earlier lower roof structure and as such it may have originally been unplastered, but there is no substantive evidence before me to suggest the original purpose of the timber. I saw at my site visit that the exposed timber has marks on it which, from the appellant's photographs, appear to correlate with the surrounding laths, and it is likely that it was historically covered with lime plaster.
11. Nevertheless, the extent of the exposed timber is minimal and therefore the loss of evidential construction methods is very limited. Given the degree of exposed timber in the house, although that may have served different

purposes, this minimal exposure is not materially harmful to the overall significance of the building.

12. Therefore, for the reasons above I conclude that the works would have no harmful effect on the special architectural and historic interest of Carpenters Cottage, a grade II listed building. Consequently, there is no conflict with policies GSP3 and L3 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011, policies DMC5 and DMC7 of the Development Management Policies Part 2 of the Local Plan 2019 or paragraphs 193, 194, and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Together these require that the significance of heritage assets is respected, conserved and where possible enhanced.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

14. I have had regard to the condition suggested by the Council regarding the provision of vertical boarding on the replacement partition wall rather than horizontal. The appellant's preference is for horizontal boarding and from the wording of the Council's application report it was on this basis that it considered the application for listed building consent. The Council has provided very limited justification for its preference for vertical boarding and I have found no harm based on the submitted plans. Therefore, I have not imposed the condition.
15. A condition relating to timeliness is necessary in the interests of certainty. There is no power under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to impose a condition regarding compliance with plans.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR