



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 24 May 2022

by A Tucker BA (Hons) IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 June 2022

Appeal A Ref: APP/Y3940/W/21/3280419

Ryleys Farmhouse, Crossroads South South East C86 To North Side of Motorway Bridge, Grittleton, SN14 6AF

- 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 Dagg against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 20/10607/FUL, dated 12 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear orangery extension together with addition of car port to rear garden.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/Y3940/Y/21/3280428

Ryleys Farmhouse, Crossroads South South East C86 To North Side of Motorway Bridge, Grittleton, SN14 6AF

- 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 Dagg against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref 20/11380/LBC, dated 12 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 February 2021.
 - The works proposed are single storey rear orangery extension together with addition of car port to rear garden.
-

Decision – Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Decision – Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeals relate to the same scheme under different legislation. I have dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning.
4. On 20 July 2021, after the Council made its decision, the Government published its revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The main parties are aware of this matter as the 2021 Framework is referred to in the submissions.
5. The appellants have submitted amended plans with the appeals. These seek to amend the design of the proposed extension by removing the low stone plinth and roof lantern and reducing the openings through the existing external wall from two to one.

6. Annex M of the Procedural Guide Planning Appeals – England¹ states that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the local planning authority, and on which interested people's views were sought. The revisions are substantial in relation to the matters of dispute. They would significantly alter the appearance of the extension and the extent of historic fabric that would be affected by the proposal.
7. With reference to the Wheatcroft Principles² I am of the view that the proposal is so changed by the revised plans that if I were to take the plans into account it would deprive those who should have been consulted on the changed development of the opportunity of such consultation. Therefore, I will base my assessment of the proposal on the plans that were before the Council when it made its decision.
8. The list description for Ryleys Farmhouse dates from 1988 and refers to the L-plan wing attached at the northwest angle. In 1997 this wing became a separate dwelling known as Ryleys Farm Cottage. Therefore, for the purpose of the appeals, the listed building known as Ryleys Farmhouse comprises both dwellings.
9. The submissions refer to an existing shed, fence and wall alongside the existing swimming pool. At my visit to the site I could see that these had been removed, leaving only a very low length of the wall.

Main Issue

10. The main issue for both appeals is the effect of the proposal upon the special interest of the grade II listed building, known as Ryleys Farmhouse.

Reasons

11. Section 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA) requires the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
12. The building dates from the mid-17th century and is a good example of a farm workers dwelling associated with a local estate. It retains significant historic fabric, its historic plan form and its rural setting. It has a formal composition to the front, with stone windows and drip moulds arranged symmetrically within an elevation of cut stone. The rear elevations have a more modest and functional appearance; constructed in rubble stone with an informal arrangement of openings. The building's traditional appearance, its historic fabric and layout and rural setting are significant contributors to its special interest.
13. The proposed extension would sit against the back of the building's main range and alongside the shorter of the two north wings. It would be set in from both gable ends. In this position it would not be visible from the main approach to the building from the west. As one moves around the building to the east it would become visible, but it would not be prominent in the context of the building's formal front façade.

¹ Paragraph M.2.1

² Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd v SSE [JPL 1982 P37]

14. At the rear the extension would be prominent to view. However, it would have a simple form that would sit neatly within an area defined by the existing building. It would appear as a clear addition and would not be over-scaled taking into account the substantial scale of the existing rearward elements of the building. It would have a simple design, without unnecessary ornamentation that might draw the eye or appear overly formal alongside the more modest character of the rear of the building.
15. A lantern roof light would sit at the top of the extension. I am satisfied that this would not be obtrusive given the substantial scale of the adjacent parts of the existing building. Areas of existing plain rubble masonry above the extension would remain visible, and there would be some visibility of the existing rubble walls through the proposed glazing, such that the historic form of the building would still be easily appreciated.
16. The proposal includes the formation of two large openings in the side wall of the kitchen of the existing dwelling. This would link the existing kitchen to the extension internally. One of these would be in the area of an existing small window, that appears to be a later insertion, whilst the other would be in an area of unaltered historic masonry. The loss of a substantial volume of historic fabric through the formation of both openings would be harmful.
17. Furthermore, the two openings would be arranged in a symmetrical manner either side of the retained beam. This would introduce an overly formal arrangement that would be at odds with the more modest and functional layout of the building and its internal character, where most openings are singular and not central, and would also be harmful.
18. The ceiling to the existing kitchen is low, and the central beam even lower. The plans do not include a section that runs through the kitchen and the proposed extension. Without this it is not possible to understand the relationship between the low ceiling of the kitchen, the height of the new openings and the ceiling height of the extension. Forming large openings in the side wall and extending the accommodation out as proposed could exacerbate the impact already felt by the room's low ceiling level.
19. The proposed garage would sit within an existing parking area, to the side of the dwelling and set well back behind the existing tree and privy. Although it would be prominent in some views across the garden it would not be visible from the access to the west.
20. It would have a simple design, with plain vertical posts dividing the three bays at the front without any braces, and timber boards to the sides and rear. The Council is concerned with its size, however if it was narrower it would look much more like a domestic garage, whereas the broad three bay form proposed would give it an appearance that would be similar to an open fronted cart shed, befitting of its agricultural setting.
21. I accept that it is away from the historic farm buildings, however it would stand in an area that is closely related to the existing building, behind the historic privy. It would limit views across the site and from the rear of the dwelling to the east. However, it would not entirely fill the gap alongside the appeal building, and it would not stand between the side of the existing building and the open land to the east. The listed building would still maintain its clear

functional and spatial association with the open agricultural land to the north and east.

22. For these reasons I find that the proposed car port would not be harmful. I am also satisfied that the overall form and position of the extension would not cause harm. However, the formation of the new openings in the side wall of the Kitchen would cause considerable harm as a result of the volume of historic fabric that would be lost, and the visual impact of the two openings on the internal character of the building. There is also some uncertainty about the relationship between the internal height of the extension, the new openings and the existing kitchen. In terms of the Framework the harm would be less than substantial. Paragraph 202 of the Framework establishes that any harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
23. It is suggested that the proposal would greatly improve the layout of the dwelling by creating additional living space and improving the flow around the ground floor. I accept that the proposed extension would create a large living and dining area that would suit modern living. However, the current ground floor accommodation is generous, providing three accessible large rooms that are easily sufficient for a large five-bedroom dwelling. I am therefore not satisfied that the proposal would aid the future conservation of the building. The additional accommodation it would provide would be solely a private benefit.
24. The existing kitchen ceiling is low and daylight to the room is limited, however based on my observation on site I cannot agree that it is so poor that the room feels oppressive. Instead, the scale and proportions of the existing kitchen are representative of many historic buildings with restricted head height and limited natural light. In any case the ceiling height would not be altered by the proposal. The daylight levels would be improved by removing substantial portions of the existing side wall, but I am not satisfied that the existing accommodation is so poor that providing additional daylight can be considered anything more than a private benefit.
25. The existing window to the side of the kitchen is not historic, however it is a simple flush fitting casement that does not appear to cause harm to the significance of the building. Similarly, the first floor window has flush fitting timber casements and traditional glazing bars that appear to be appropriate for the context. The top opening fanlight is a more modern detail that is not found elsewhere on this part of the building. A modest heritage related public benefit would arise from the replacement of this unit as proposed, omitting the existing top opening fanlight.
26. There would also be a similarly modest benefit arising from the rationalisation of the existing soil pipe stack, which has a harmful appearance. Although this is limited by the lack of details before me to show how waste water would be taken from the two bathrooms once the proposed extension is in place.
27. The proposal would cause harm to the special interest of the building. Paragraph 199 of the Framework establishes that great weight should be given to the conservation of a heritage asset. The public benefits before me are limited and are not sufficient to outweigh the harm identified.
28. In summary, the proposal would fail to meet the requirements of the LBCA as it would fail to preserve the special interest of the building. It would thus be

contrary to Policies 57 and 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy 2015, which together seek to ensure that proposals conserve designated heritage assets.

Conclusion

29. For the reasons above, both appeals should be dismissed.

A Tucker

INSPECTOR