
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2021

by Benjamin Webb BA(Hons) MA MA MSc PGDip(UD) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/21/3268296

Vayre House, Hatters Lane, Chipping Sodbury BS37 6AA

- 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 Graham Bond against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P20/16192/F, dated 28 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey timber framed /clad outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey timber framed /clad outbuilding, at Vayre House, Hatters Lane, Chipping Sodbury BS37 6AA, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P20/16192/F, dated 28 August 2020.

Procedural Matters

2. I have used an edited version of the description of development provided on the application form in the banner heading above, omitting unnecessary references to the application type and location.
3. The development has already been undertaken. I have therefore based my assessment below and my decision above on the development as completed.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the development has preserved the setting of a Grade II listed building, Vayre House.

Reasons

5. Insofar as it is relevant to this appeal, the special interest and significance of the listed building resides in its late C17th origin, its apparent historic role as a farmhouse, the architectural character and detailing of the main domestic range, and its relationship with an attached group of more functional former agricultural structures to the rear. The latter are arranged around a courtyard and are currently in use as a restaurant. I consider that all are covered by the listing.
6. The restaurant entrance, garden and car park are currently located at the rear of the courtyard range. I have not been provided with any clear indication of how these buildings appeared prior to their conversion, or what the historic

functional role or relationship was with the space to their rear. The current character of this space however contributes little, if anything to an understanding of their past functional character. This in large part because it has been heavily 'domesticated' within the context of its role as a restaurant garden. This includes garden planting and a wide range of typical garden paraphernalia, including a shed, gazebo, decking, arbour and planters.

7. The building subject of this appeal is another such standard garden structure, which occupies the former site of a steel framed shelter. The latter was roofed in corrugated sheeting, and of more substantial size but of similar form. Unlike the previous structure the current structure does not bear upon and obscure the roof of the listed building. Its roof does however similarly over-sail the eaves, and this, together with its differing roof plane, provides a visually awkward relationship between it and the listed building from certain perspectives. The new shelter nonetheless represents a considerable improvement over the previous structure, both physically and aesthetically. It furthermore relates reasonably well to the rest of the restaurant garden. For this reason, and in view of my findings above, it neither appears as harmful clutter, nor detracts from an appreciation of the significance of the listed building.
8. The view from a communal parking area in Manor Way, a modern residential cul-de-sac to the north, has been drawn to my attention. Manor Way itself contributes nothing obvious to the significance of the listed building. The view of the listed building from this location is itself so limited that its significance is incapable of full appreciation. Consequently, in no sense does the visibility of the back of the appeal structure alongside a small part of the listed building give rise to any particular harm.
9. For the reasons outlined above I conclude that the development has preserved the setting of Vayre House. It therefore complies with Policy CS9 of Local Plan: Core Strategy (the CS) and Policy PSP17 of the Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (the PSP) which each seek to conserve heritage assets; and Policy CS1 of the CS and Policy PSP1 of the PSP, which similarly seek to secure development which respects and enhances the character and distinctiveness of sites and their contexts.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Benjamin Webb

INSPECTOR