



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2022

by Matthew Jones BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/Y/21/3289691

25 Church Street, Sturminster Newton DT10 1DB

- 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 J Fielding against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref P/LBC/2021/00411, dated 16 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2021.
 - The works proposed are single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for single storey rear extension at 25 Church Street, Sturminster Newton DT10 1DB in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P/LBC/2021/00411, dated 16 February 2021, and the plans submitted therewith, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than three years from the date of this consent.
 - 2) Prior to installation, samples of the roof and walling materials shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 3) Prior to installation, details of the design of the external door shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details

Procedural Matter

2. The proposed plans were amended before listed building consent was refused. I have assessed the appeal on the basis of the plans subject to that decision.

Main Issue

3. 25 Church Street forms part of the circa 1800 Grade II listed building 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27, Church Street, a terrace of cottages within the Sturminster Newton Conservation Area (the CA). In this context, the main issue is the effect of the works on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and, linked to that, whether the works would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

Reasons

4. The significance of the terrace derives in part from its modest scale and plan form, its fenestration and its brick walls, which are laid in a pleasing decorative Flemish bond with flared headers, set above a rubble plinth. This in turn allows the building to contribute to the character and appearance of the CA.

5. The rear of the terrace, however, presents a somewhat different storey. Here the fenestration loses uniformity, and the brickwork is in several places heavily altered, and has not always been re-laid in a Flemish bond. Indeed, there are even areas of historic brickwork bonded in a mixture of ways.
6. The level of alteration is particularly obvious at No 25, which appears to have been largely rebuilt and reconfigured, features a clear vertical joint, modern bricks laid in both English and Flemish Bond without flared headers, and a large lintel. The window and adjacent door are not of historic interest. Thus, the fabric sought for removal is not significant nor essential to retain.
7. Moreover, wall returns would be set into the existing rear elevation, and the extension would be modestly proportioned, ensuring that the cottage's historic plan form would be respected, and its legibility preserved. Whilst the extension would sit close to existing windows, I understand that a similar rear enlargement recently filled this space. The rooflight would be adequately subservient within the roofslope. As such, the significance of the terrace would be unharmed, and the character and appearance of the CA preserved.
8. Consequently, the works would satisfy the requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Policy 5 of the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (adopted 2016), which requires schemes to conserve the historic environment, and the approach to designated heritage assets set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

9. In order to secure the detailed finishes of the scheme, it is necessary for samples of the wall and roof finish materials to be submitted to the Council and agreed prior to their installation. A condition is also required to ensure that the detailed design of the rear door is appropriate.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons outlined above, and taking all other matters raised into account, I shall allow the appeal.

Matthew Jones

INSPECTOR