



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2023

by A Price BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/Y/22/3310136

The Pink Cottage, 32 Roundhouse Lane, Fawley, Buckinghamshire RG9 6JF

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr James Batting against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/05611/LBC, dated 7 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2022.
 - The works proposed are described on the application form as 'to insert a conservation roof window'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed works would preserve the Grade II listed building, The Round House and Pink Cottage, or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

Special interest and significance

3. The appeal site comprises a Grade II listed building¹, formed of the dwelling, Pink Cottage, and adjoining The Round House. Pink Cottage (the appeal building) is of 16th Century origins, with 20th Century alterations. The cottage is rendered and colour-washed in pink, with a tiled roof that forms a prominent architectural feature of the property. Despite its extension over time, the front of the appeal building retains a picturesque and modest architectural form. Those later alterations and extensions have not unduly eroded the building's intrinsic heritage merit.
4. Notwithstanding that the fabric of that later part of the roof may be of limited historic value, its plain and unbroken form, using traditional tiles, contributes in a positive way to the property's architectural interest.
5. Based on the evidence before me, the listed building's special interest and significance is largely derived from its 16th and 18th century rural domestic architecture which has evolved over time, and its visually charming architectural style. Important contributors in these regards, which are pertinent to the appeal, are the use of traditional construction techniques and materials, as well as the building's general simplicity in form, particularly its roofscape.

¹ Heritage List for England, List Entry Number: 1125733

Appeal proposal and effects

6. The proposed works involve the installation of a rooflight in the front roofslope of Pink Cottage. This would serve an existing bathroom on the first floor which currently relies on light from the adjoining bedroom by means of an internal window.
7. The existing roofslope is interrupted only by historic gable features and is otherwise intact. The installation of the proposed rooflight would be highly visible and would disrupt this predominantly unaltered roofslope, detracting from the listed building. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that this part of the roof is not historic. Nevertheless, even were I to conclude that the removal of this fabric would not be significant, this would not lessen the harm to the listed building overall.
8. I also acknowledge that a 'conservation style' rooflight is proposed, made from cast iron, with the appellant's contention that such installations are sometimes used in listed buildings. However, that a 'conservation style' rooflight is proposed, as opposed to any other type of roof opening, does not outweigh or lessen the harm identified. Moreover, there is limited detail before me to fully understand the effects/extent of any harm in respect of the size, profile and installation of that rooflight.
9. Overall, I conclude that the proposed works would fail to preserve the Grade II listed building, The Round House and Pink Cottage, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, contrary to the requirements of section 16(2) of the Act. Consequently, the proposal would harm the special interest and significance of this designated heritage asset.

Public benefits and balance

10. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to their conservation. Paragraph 200 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting and that this should have clear and convincing justification.
11. With reference to Paragraphs 201 and 202 of the Framework, in finding harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. Given the extent of the works relative to the building, I find the harm to the listed building to be 'less than substantial' in this instance but, nevertheless, of considerable importance and weight. Under such circumstances, Paragraph 202 advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes securing the asset's optimum viable use.
12. I accept that listed buildings need to evolve. However, I am not persuaded that the scheme before me is fundamentally necessary to secure the optimum viable use of the building. Whilst the purchase and installation of the rooflight would provide some economic benefits, these would be very limited. These very limited public benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm identified. As such, clear and convincing justification for allowing the appeal has not been demonstrated. The primary outcome of the proposal, namely the installation of a rooflight to provide natural daylight into the bathroom, would

be a private benefit to the appellant. There is no substantive evidence before me that the works would provide improved ventilation.

13. Overall, there are insufficient public benefits before me to outweigh the considerable importance and weight that I attach to the harm I have found. Accordingly, the proposed works would fail to preserve the Grade II listed building, The Round House and Pink Cottage, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, contrary to the requirements of section 16(2) of the Act and the relevant provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment. The proposed works would also conflict with Policies CP9, CP11, DM20 and DM31 of the Wycombe District Council Local Plan (2019), which taken as a whole seek that proposals sustain the significance of heritage assets.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, having had regard to all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Price

INSPECTOR