



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2021

by Elaine Worthington BA (Hons) MTP MUED MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/Y/21/3268917

2 Husteads Lane, Dobcross, OL3 5RA

- 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 John Gerald against the decision of Oldham Council.
 - The application Ref LB/344219/19, dated 26 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2021.
 - The works proposed are described as 'My name is John Gerald and I live at 2 Husteads, Dobcross, OL3 5RA. I would like to request Listed Building Approval for the addition of an Orangery to the rear of our property. We have recently completed the renovation of the property which is a semi-detached farmhouse and we received The Certificate of Completion, FP/195937/16 in August 2019. As part of the renovation we had to remove a section of the rear garden at the back of the house to open up/expose the original rear cart gate because the rear of the property was over 1 metre under ground level. The next proposed step in the garden reconstruction would be to build a retaining wall to support the exposed banking. We would like to request Listed Building Approval to add a traditional type of 'lean to' Orangery constructed in stone, wood and glass within the excavated area, this would encompass the rear cart gate, this would mean that no additional opening would need to be constructed and the exterior fabric of the building would remain intact. I have included a number of photographs of the rear of the building. We feel that we have renovated the building in a sympathetic manner in keeping with the age and style of the house, retaining many original features. The work that we have carried out on the exterior of the property includes laying Yorkshire stone flagging and traditional dry stone walling and we would intend that the proposed Orangery is again in keeping with age and style of the house.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. As the proposed works relate to a listed building, I have had special regard to sections 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed works would preserve the Grade II listed building, Husteads farmhouse and cottage and adjoining barn, Husteads lane (Ref: 1068172) and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.
-

Reasons

4. The listed building includes the mid eighteenth century two storey stone built farmhouse, cottage and adjoining barn which are all historically linked. The appeal property is the adjoining barn which is constructed of square rubble with a graduated stone slate roof. The barn has been converted into a dwelling, but the works have been undertaken sympathetically such that its historic openings, proportions and features have been for the most part retained. Notably, a segmental arched former cart entry has been retained as a glazed opening to its front elevation. The opposed rear cart entry has also been retained on the building's rear elevation and is also similarly glazed to provide a door and windows. This historic opening typical of a barn, and in particular a threshing barn, remains a conspicuous feature on the former agricultural building's rear elevation.
5. As a consequence, despite its residential use, the building maintains an attractive rural appearance and character with distinctive functional detailing and original openings, an uncomplicated design, modest proportions and a simple linear form. Thus, its historic form and function is still clearly legible. The agricultural origins of the building and its former functional relationships with the farmhouse and cottage also remain readily discernible.
6. From the evidence before me, insofar as it relates to this appeal, I therefore find that the special interest of the listed building is drawn from its generally modest scale and proportions typical of its rural location, as well as from its remaining distinctive historic openings and architectural features described above which attest to its agricultural history and role as part of the wider farmstead.
7. The proposed single storey orangery extension would be to the rear of the appeal property. It would be around 3 metres deep and 5.4 metres wide with a lean to roof with a maximum height of some 3.6 metres. It would be constructed of reclaimed stone with a slate roof, two rooflights and timber framed windows/doors in the side elevations. The use of traditional materials indicated by the appellant would be generally in-keeping with the host building and the Yorkshire stone flagging and traditional dry stone retaining walling that surrounds it to the rear. Access to the proposed orangery from the dwelling would be via the existing rear cart entry opening which would be retained. As such, no additional opening to the rear of the building would be constructed, and no of the historic fabric would result.
8. That said, the proposed extension would be prominently sited and cover a good deal of the rear elevation of the building. It would have a blank rear facing wall. The lean-to roof would be tall and extend almost up to the eaves of the host building. As such, it would be an over-dominant and distracting addition to the modest former agricultural building that would disrupt its simple linear form and fail to respect its modest proportions. Moreover, the proposed works would completely cover the historic arched cart entry opening on the rear of the building. This would be totally obscured from view as a result of the works. Any appreciation of this distinctive historic opening and its characteristic architectural features including the segmental header which directly tell of the building's historic agricultural use, would be lost.
9. Taking these factors into account, I find that the proposal would be an unsympathetic and over-dominant addition that would conflict with the simple

architectural form and proportions of the listed building. It would erode the scale and simplicity of the historic building and conceal a good deal of the remaining extent of its historic fabric including the important rear cart entry opening. Its massing, design and position would undermine what remains of the uncomplicated form and characteristic architectural detailing of the agricultural building and as a consequence, the proposal would seriously impair its historic legibility thus failing to preserve its special interest.

10. I therefore conclude that the proposed works would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building. I give this harm considerable importance and weight in the balance of this appeal.
11. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises at paragraph 193 that when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 194 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets or from development within their setting and that this should have a clear and convincing justification. I consider that the harm to the listed building in this case would be less than substantial, but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 196 of the Framework requires that less than substantial harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
12. The appellant refers to support for the proposed works from the local Parish Council and the Saddleworth Parish Council, but no public benefits have been put forward which would outweigh the harm to the designated heritage asset that I have identified. For these reasons the proposed works would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and paragraph 192 of the Framework and would be in conflict with the development plan insofar as it applies.

Other Matters

13. The appellant refers to other examples of similar extensions in the local area. However, no further details of these have been provided and I am unaware of the circumstances that led to any such works. Accordingly, this adds no weight in favour of the appeal scheme. Although I am aware that the appellant feels that there were delays in the determination of the application and a lack of opportunity to discuss the decision, that it is a matter between the appellant and the Council. I confirm that I have determined the appeal scheme on its own individual merits and made my own assessment as to its impacts.
14. Whilst no details have been provided, the appellant indicates that he would be willing to adjust the roof pitch of the appeal scheme and also to consider an alternative glass and frame construction. Be that as is may, any such alternative schemes are not before me for consideration and would need to be the subject of a further application to the Council. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans refused consent by the Council.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all the other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Worthington

INSPECTOR