



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 20 April 2021

by S Edwards MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 May 2021

Appeal A Ref: APP/D1265/W/20/3263432

8 High Street, Wool BH20 6BP

- 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 Mounsey against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref 6/2020/0316, dated 12 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed rear single storey extension (existing canopy and post to be removed) and proposed internal ground floor wc'.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/D1265/Y/20/3263430

8 High Street, Wool BH20 6BP

- 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 Mounsey against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref 6/2020/0317, dated 12 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 October 2020.
 - The works proposed are described as 'proposed rear single storey extension (existing canopy and post to be removed) and proposed internal ground floor wc'.
-

Decisions

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

Preliminary Matters

3. The proposed development and works relate to a listed building located within a conservation area, and I shall therefore have special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act). Both appeals relate to the same site, and I shall consider the Council's decisions to refuse planning permission and listed building consent in a single document, given their similarities, and in the interests of brevity.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposed development and works would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building known as 8 High Street, and preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Wool Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. Located within the Wool Conservation Area, the appeal site comprises a Grade II listed building which, according to the listing description, was probably constructed during the eighteenth century. This attractive thatched building is made of a relatively symmetric cottage to the left hand side and a simpler, more functional store to the right, which has been incorporated as part of the main dwelling. A single storey extension, which is characterised by its brick finish and slate roof, has been previously constructed to the rear of the cottage.
6. Although the rear elevation of the cottage section is largely hidden from view by the existing extension, by virtue of its width and low eaves height, the simple and vernacular character of the store section can still be appreciated. Given the above, the significance of the listed building is primarily derived from its architectural and historic interest as a traditional cottage, reflecting the local area's rural vernacular.
7. From my observations, and having regard to the Wool Conservation Area Appraisal Document¹, the special interest of this designated heritage asset resides principally in the rich collection of historic buildings displaying various architectural styles, which make up the core of the settlement. The appeal property is no exception and, by reason of its significance, makes an important contribution to the character and appearance of the Wool Conservation Area.
8. Despite its single storey scale, the proposed development would span across the entire width of the property's former store element and represent a disproportionate addition to the listed property relative to the footprint of the original cottage. By reason of its excessive size, the new addition would thus erode the appreciation of the listed building, especially as the rear elevation would be entirely screened by subsequent additions, including the rear passageway opening. Furthermore, it would blur the clear distinction between the historic cottage and store components of the property.
9. I am also concerned with the design of the proposed extension, which would involve a combination of lean-to, gable and flat roof elements. A section of roof would also be cut out to ensure that the first floor window serving bedroom 1 remains unaffected by the proposal. The resulting built form would appear as a contrived and overly complicated addition, which would harmfully contrast with the simplicity of the host dwelling. Although a contemporary design approach may in some cases be appropriate, the choice of modern materials such as ivory aluminium and the extensive use of glazing would in this instance only exacerbate the awkward and alien nature of the proposal.
10. It is of note that the rear of the property is not widely visible within the street scene, but the proposed extension would nevertheless be noticeable from neighbouring properties. Furthermore, I am mindful that listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether or not public views of the property can be gained.
11. My attention has been drawn to a number of listed buildings in the area, which have been subject to large extensions over the last forty or fifty years. However, I do not have the full details of the circumstances that led to these

¹ Adopted February 2012.

proposals being accepted and so cannot be certain that they represent a direct parallel to the proposal before me, notably in respect of development plan and national planning policy.

12. The proposed development and works would fail to preserve the significance of no 8 High Street. As this Grade II listed building makes an important contribution to the character and appearance of the Wool Conservation Area, it follows that the appeal scheme would also have a detrimental effect on this designated heritage asset. The magnitude of the harm would be less than substantial, to which I ascribe considerable importance and weight.
13. In such circumstances, paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires the identified harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Although the appeal scheme would provide additional residential accommodation for the occupiers of the dwelling, these would constitute private benefits. Any alterations would need to be carried out in a manner which does not prejudice the significance of this Grade II listed property.
14. The proposed development and works would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building known as no 8 High Street, and the character and appearance of the Wool Conservation Area. The appeal scheme would therefore conflict with Policies D and LHH of the Purbeck Local Plan Part 1², the Purbeck District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document³ and the Wool Conservation Area Appraisal Document. Amongst other things, these expect development proposals to be of a high quality design and conserve the appearance, setting, character, interest, integrity, health and vitality of heritage assets. For these reasons, the proposal would also not accord with sections 2, 12 and 16 of the Framework, sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Act.

Conclusion

15. The benefits associated with the proposal would not outweigh the harm that has been identified and thus the conflict with the development plan. There are no considerations which indicate that the appeals should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons detailed above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR

² Adopted November 2012.

³ Adopted January 2014.