



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 20 June 2023

by Zoe Raygen DipURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th July 2023

Appeal A Ref: APP/V0510/W/22/3310816

24 Main Street, Coveney CB6 2DJ

- 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 Chris Senior against the decision of East Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00997/FUL, dated 23 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is extension to rear of property.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/V0510/Y/22/3310819

24 Main Street, Coveney CB6 2DJ

- 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 Chris Senior against the decision of East Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00998/LBC, dated 23 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is extension to rear of property.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The two appeals concern the same scheme under different, complementary legislation. I have dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning.
4. As the appeals relate to a listed building, I have had special regard to section 16(2) and section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

5. The main issue for both appeals is the effect of the development and works on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

Reasons

Significance

6. No 24 Main Street is a Grade II listed building. It is a single storey cottage constructed from brick with an attic storey and thatched roof. The original building was constructed in the eighteenth century and some of that fabric

remains including the front elevation doorcase and dormer and casement windows being in their original positions. Original historic fabric features at the north-west of the current house, including approximately two thirds of the west front elevation and south gable end. There is some variation in the historic brick work, with yellow stock brick included over the front ground storey case wall and red brick used across ground and attic storeys at the south gable.

7. The thatch roof is a reinstatement after 2003 replacing an early twentieth century tin roof together with the introduction of modern casement and dormer windows on the rear east elevation of the historic building. The main rear offshoot has been entirely rebuilt, albeit in the original plan form of the cottage and designed to match the historic part of the dwelling.
8. The significance of the building for the purposes of this appeal is largely drawn from its surviving historic fabric and simple form providing an understanding of the construction and appearance of early rural dwellings in the local area.
9. The village of Coveney was historically formed from a number of small farmsteads, of which it appears, from the appellant's evidence, that the appeal site is an example of. The 1840 tithe map and 1886, 1902 and 1927 OS maps all show the simple building to the front of the site with a variety of outbuildings within the large plot to the side and rear located away from the house allowing an appreciation of all its elevations.

Impact on significance

10. A garage has been built at the property to the northeast adjacent to the boundary and set back from the house. This approximately reflects the position of previous outbuildings on the site. To the southwest is a modest outbuilding set some distance from the house and subordinate to its plan and form.
11. Planning permission has also been granted, by the Council, for a single storey rear extension running at right angles to the rear off shoot and attached to it with a small link. Effectively this hides the main rear elevation of the building from views and enlarges the simple plan form of the dwelling.
12. The proposed extension would be located to the rear of the main offshoot and extend the dwelling almost the extent of the existing rear offshoot further into the garden. The extension would be single storey, lower than the house and designed to reflect an agricultural building. However, it would have a large size and mass which together with the existing extension would mean that the whole rear of the building would be engulfed in extension and the simple plan form would be considerably eroded. The large expanse of roof of the extension would be particularly visible from the road, emphasising the resulting considerable extent. Consequently, the ability to appreciate its significance both in appearance and plan form would be diminished.
13. Although it would be slightly set away from the dwelling and attached via a glazed link, this is entirely different to the detached outbuildings of the former homestead which were located well away from the main house allowing it to dominate the site.
14. I am aware that there was an extension on the rear of the building. Whether or not this was in place when the building was listed, from the evidence before me it was a smaller size and mass to that proposed now and therefore not directly comparable.

15. Given the above, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the significance of the listed building. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of 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 the alteration or destruction of those assets or from development within their setting and that this should have a clear and convincing justification. In this instance I find the harm to be less than substantial, but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.
16. Under such circumstances, paragraph 202 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes the securing of optimal viable use of listed buildings. There is no evidence before me that without this extension the future of the listed building would be at risk.
17. The proposal would incorporate materials to reduce energy demand and emissions, as well as a ground source heat pump and an array of solar photovoltaic panels. The appellant considers that these measures would enhance the optimum viable use of the listed building as a dwellinghouse, by increasing the ability of the building to function as a modern dwelling house and reducing living costs. While these would be a benefit of the scheme which would increase energy efficiency and contribute to the Government's Net Zero strategy, there is no evidence before me to demonstrate that they could not be delivered in a less harmful manner. I therefore give these benefits modest weight and they would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm to the significance of the listed building.
18. Given the above, I conclude that, on balance, the proposed extension would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 199 of the Framework and conflict with policy ENV12 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015. Together these require that there should be no detrimental impact on the visual, architectural and historical significance of listed buildings.

Conclusion

19. I have identified that there would be harm to the significance of the listed building. The benefits I have identified above are not sufficient to outweigh the conflict with the development plan. Therefore, for the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that, on balance, both appeals should be dismissed

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR