



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 July 2023

by Benjamin Webb BA(Hons) MA MA MSc PGDip(UD) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/Y/22/3311931

Christmas Cottage, Uploders, Bridport, Dorset DT6 4NS

- 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 R Wise and Ms N Keech against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref P/LBC/2022/01211, dated 23 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 August 2022.
 - The works proposed are described as erect extension and carry out associated alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. This appeal relates to an application for listed building consent. Whilst it was submitted with a separate application for planning permission, and both were refused, the planning application is not the subject of appeal. Were this appeal to be allowed therefore it would grant listed building consent only.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the scheme on designated heritage assets, and specifically: whether the scheme would preserve a Grade II listed building and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, and whether the scheme would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Uploders Conservation Area (the Conservation Area).

Reasons

4. The appeal property, together with The Cabin, is a Grade II listed building. Whilst the Act sets out the desirability of preserving listed buildings, paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) makes clear that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets.
5. The appeal property originated as 2 cottages of single room depth, which together with The Cabin formed a row of 3. Insofar as it is relevant to this appeal the special interest and significance of the listed building resides in the simple linear form of the original building, its modest scale, and vernacular construction.
6. The listed building has been the subject of previous extension. This includes a bulky 2-storey extension attached to the back of The Cabin, and a more

modest 2-storey extension attached to the back of Christmas Cottage. Both project to the rear, their ridge lines running perpendicular to that of the original building. Viewed from the rear, these extensions obscure and disturb the linear form and modest scale of the original building, with the adverse effect greatest in relation to the extension attached to The Cabin. A single storey lean-to of somewhat more complementary form otherwise runs across the rear elevation of Christmas Cottage. Even this appears likely to exceed the scale of any historic addition it replaced.

7. The appeal proposal would see a flat roofed extension added to the lean-to, and the existing 2-storey extension extended further to the rear, but with ridge stepped down. Each would feature roof coverings of contrasting type.
8. These additions would shift the already strained balance between the original building and later additions, with the effects perceptible both internally and externally. At ground floor level the space contained within extensions would exceed that contained within the original building, whilst externally there would be a significant increase in the cumulative scale and mass of additions. This would be accentuated in views of the latter by the steep fall in ground level to the rear. In each regard the modest form, character and layout of the original building would be further obscured.
9. Insofar as the proposed design would feature differing forms and materials, it would additionally add a degree of complexity that would appear alien within context. This would be particularly true of the flat roofed extension whose attachment would require an awkward junction with the lean-to roof. The proposed design would thus additionally detract from appreciation of the simplicity of the original building.
10. The original building has clearly been the subject of extensive modifications, some of which have diminished its special interest and significance. This does not however justify further works which would introduce a new source of harm, or accentuate existing harm. As such, the fact that the new extensions would extend no further back than the existing addition to The Cabin does not weigh in favour of the appeal scheme. I therefore find that the scheme would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building and fail to conserve its significance. The harm caused would be less than substantial. Such harm attracts great weight.
11. The listed building is located within the Conservation Area. Again, insofar as it is relevant to this appeal, the significance of the Conservation Area resides in the historic layout of the settlement and the historic buildings and spaces that this contains. As one such building, the listed building makes a positive contribution.
12. The rear elevation of the listed building is not visible within the streetscene, and though public views may exist into the Conservation Area from higher ground to the rear, these views would be across a distance. A Conservation Area is nonetheless a sum of its parts, and by adversely affecting the character and significance of the listed building, the scheme would in turn adversely affect the contribution that the listed building makes to the character and significance of the Conservation Area as a whole. The scheme would not therefore preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, nor conserve its significance. The adverse effect in this case would be

modest, and the harm caused again less than substantial. Such harm attracts considerable importance and weight.

13. Given my findings above, and in accordance with paragraph 202 of the Framework, it is necessary to weigh the harm that would be caused by the scheme against the public benefits it would generate.
14. The scheme would provide additional living space for the occupants. This would however be a private benefit and so it does not attract weight.
15. Implementing the scheme would generate minor work/trade for businesses. However, the benefits of this to the broader economy would be negligible, and so attract negligible weight. That being so, the public benefits of the scheme would not outweigh the harm that it would cause.
16. For the reasons outlined above I conclude that the appeal scheme would have an unacceptable effect on designated heritage assets, failing to preserve the special interest of the listed building, and failing to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The scheme would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, heritage policy set out within the Framework, and, insofar as it is relevant, conflict with Policy ENV4 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan 2015 which generally reflects national policy in respect of heritage assets.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Benjamin Webb

INSPECTOR