

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 4 January 2022

by S Edwards BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2022

Appeal A Ref: APP/P2114/W/21/3271223

Pidford Manor, Main Road, Rookley, I.W PO38 3NL

- 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 & Mrs S Ross against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01887/HOU, dated 30 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed garden room'.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/P2114/Y/21/3271228

Pidford Manor, Main Road, Rookley, I.W PO38 3NL

- 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 & Mrs S Ross against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01888/LBC, dated 30 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2020.
 - The works proposed are described as 'proposed garden room'.
-

Appeal C Ref: APP/P2114/W/21/3278641

Pidford Manor, Main Road, Rookley, I.W PO38 3NL

- 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 & Mrs S Ross against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00243/HOU, dated 30 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed garden room'.
-

Appeal D Ref: APP/P2114/Y/21/3278640

Pidford Manor, Main Road, Rookley, I.W PO38 3NL

- 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 & Mrs S Ross against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00244/LBC, dated 30 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2021.
 - The works proposed are described as 'proposed garden room'.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
 2. Appeal B is dismissed.
 3. Appeal C is dismissed.
 4. Appeal D is dismissed.
-

Preliminary Matters

5. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published after the determination of the applications. Policies within the Framework are material considerations which should be taken into account for the purposes of decision-making from the date of its publication. The parties were given the opportunity to comment on this matter, and I have had regard to the revised Framework in determining this appeal.
6. The proposed development and works would affect a Grade II listed building, and I have therefore had special regard to sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act). As the appeals relate to the same site and raise similar issues, I shall consider them in a single document, in the interests of brevity.

Main Issue

7. 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 Pidford Manor.

Reasons

8. Located within an area of rural character, the appeal site comprises a substantial Grade II listed building and a number of outbuildings set within spacious landscaped grounds, which make an important contribution to the setting of the residential property. As detailed within the listing description, Pidford Manor is thought to date from the 18th century.
9. Although the property has been subject to numerous alterations and extensions, it retains much of its Georgian character, which includes a very symmetrical façade, with its five window range and central open pedimented wooden doorcase, Tuscan half columns and six panelled door. Attached to Pidford Manor is a cottage of 18th century appearance, which is of stone rubble construction, with red brick dressings.
10. There is no doubt that this Grade II listed building is of rich architectural interest, notably by virtue of the contrast between the polite and elegant façade and the vernacular character of the cottage, which shows how the property has evolved over time. The significance of this listed building also resides in its historic interest as a country house which, together with the group value that it holds with the separately listed Brewhouse and Stable, identify them as important components of the architectural design, craftsmanship and plan form of the 18th century.
11. The appellants are seeking planning permission (Appeals A and C) and listed building consent (Appeals B and D) for the construction of a garden room to the northern elevation of the property. The assertive modernity of the detailing, particularly in respects of Appeals A and B, is intended to create a stark contrast between the proposed addition and the historic fabric of the building.
12. Whilst a contemporary design approach may be appropriate in some circumstances, the garden room would here appear as a discordant addition to the listed property, by reason of the jarring juxtaposition of the monopitched

roof of the existing extension and the flat roof of the proposal. Despite the more traditional design of the orangery (Appeals C and D), its relationship with the existing extension would appear equally incongruous, and cause harm to the special architectural interest of the listed property.

13. I understand that the garden room, as part of both schemes, has been designed with a flat roof, notably to limit the overall height of the structure and its impact on the listed building. However, the roof form would, in combination with the extensive areas of glazing, fail to reflect the simpler and more functional appearance of the building's northern elevation which, as noted above, makes a notable contribution to the special interest of Pidford Manor. The use of quality materials such as natural stone (Appeals A and B) and oak (Appeals C and D) and features such as the roof lantern would do little to offset the harm which would be caused by the proposals.
14. As a result, both schemes would detract from the architectural integrity of the listed house and erode the appreciation of this designated heritage asset, to the detriment of its significance. It is noted that the proposed garden room would not be visible within the public realm. However, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether or not public views of the property can be gained. I therefore afford very limited weight to this consideration.
15. The proposed development and works would cause less than substantial harm to the special interest of the Grade II listed building, to which I ascribe considerable importance and weight. In these circumstances, paragraph 202 of the Framework requires the harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
16. The appeal scheme would provide additional accommodation to the occupiers of the listed property, but these would largely constitute private benefits. Having regard to the available evidence, I have also no reasons to believe that the continued occupation of the listed property is dependent on the construction of the garden room. Overall, I have been presented with no public benefits, which would outweigh the identified harm.
17. Given the above, the proposals would fail to preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed building. Both schemes would therefore conflict with Policies DM2 and DM11 of the Island Plan: Isle of Wight Core Strategy (March 2012), which seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high quality and inclusive design, whilst positively conserving and enhancing the special character of the Island's historic and built environment. They would also be contrary to the aims of sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Act, as well as paragraphs 199 and 202 of the Framework.

Other Matters

18. No concerns have been raised by the Council regarding the effect of the proposals on the significance of the Grade II listed Brewhouse and Stables, as derived from their respective settings, and there are no reasons for me to reach an alternative view. Accordingly, I confirm that the proposals would preserve the special interest of these nearby designated heritage assets.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons detailed above, and having regard to all other matters raised, there are no material considerations which indicate that the appeals should be determined, other than in accordance with the development plan. I conclude that appeals A, B, C and D should be dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR