



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 8 February 2024

by Geoff Underwood BA(Hons) PGDip(Urb Cons) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 April 2024

Appeal A Ref: APP/D1265/W/23/3322534

Worth Cottage, Worth Matravers, Dorset BH19 3LQ

- 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 Nick Whitwell against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref P/HOU/2023/00083, dated 4 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is a rear extension to provide garden room and bedroom.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/D1265/Y/23/3322536

Worth Cottage, Worth Matravers, Dorset BH19 3LQ

- 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 Nick Whitwell against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref P/LBC/2023/00084, dated 4 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2023.
 - The works proposed are a rear extension to provide garden room and bedroom.
-

Decisions

1. Appeals A and B are allowed.
2. Planning permission is granted for a rear extension to provide garden room and bedroom at Worth Cottage, Worth Matravers, Dorset BH19 3LQ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P/HOU/2023/00083, dated 4 January 2023, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule attached to this decision letter.
3. Listed building consent is granted for a rear extension to provide garden room and bedroom at Worth Cottage, Worth Matravers, Dorset BH19 3LQ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P/LBC/2023/00084, dated 4 January 2023 and the plans submitted with it, subject to conditions set out in the schedule attached to this decision letter.

Preliminary Matters

4. As set out above there are two appeals which relate to the same proposal and site under different, but complementary, legislation. I have considered each appeal on its own merits although to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two appeals together, except where otherwise indicated.
5. The site is located within the Worth Matravers Conservation Area (WMCA). Although the development's and works' effect on that particular designated heritage asset is not mentioned in the Council's reasons for refusal, I am

nevertheless required by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area in determining both appeals.

Main Issue

6. Therefore, the main issue raised by both appeals is the effect the proposed extension would have on the special architectural or historic interest of Worth Farmhouse and Worth Cottage, a grade II listed building, and on the character or appearance of the WMCA.

Reasons

7. Worth Farmhouse and Cottage has a 'double-pile' plan and consists of two parallel ranges. The listed building faces onto a courtyard which includes converted farm buildings which gives it an enclosed character to the front, Farmhouse aspect. The Worth Cottage range abuts the Farmhouse to the rear where the two ranges' respective pitched roofs meet in a valley, crossed by a perpendicular pitched roof link at one end.
8. The rear, Worth Cottage, range of the listed building has a predominantly linear plan form and arrangement at ground floor, longer and narrower than that of the adjoining Farmhouse range. However, this is only one component of the overall plan form of the listed building which is different at the front as indicated by the central front door to the property. These two ranges of the listed building have different aspects to the front and rear but share many common elements. Those differences in configuration tell part of the listed building's story through the relative arrangements and likely hierarchy of uses of the various elements such that, although the layout of The Cottage is an important and integral element of its configuration, it is not a dominant one.
9. The listed building derives considerable significance from its distinctive Purbeck stone construction and roofing, its age, former uses, attractive traditional architecture and layout, and its setting amongst the historic buildings and streets of the village, which in turn give WMCA considerable significance. Its attributes as listed building therefore also make a positive contribution to the significance of the WMCA.
10. As well as the main, linear element of Worth Cottage an outbuilding adjacent to the road has been incorporated into the house by way of a modest extension, both of which create a staggered relationship with the listed building with roof ridges parallel to the main ridges of the listed building. These remain legible as subservient elements from both outside and within, where the linear plan form of the Cottage part of the listed building is clearly discernible in the largely single aspect living and dining rooms, with the extension serving as an entrance and circulation space with the additions.
11. The proposal would insert a single storey extension within the corner currently formed by that extension and outbuilding. It would extend into the garden with a perpendicular orientation to that of the main part of the Cottage and Farmhouse. The proposed use of matching Purbeck stone for walls and roof would retain the significance that those materials contribute to the listed building. The use of traditional materials and fenestration of vertical emphasis and sensitive proportions would strike a balance between the extension being

of its time whilst not visually competing with the host building. Whilst part of the outhouse gable wall would be incorporated into the proposed extension its gable and chimney would remain and from its other three sides its shape, form and history would remain clearly legible.

12. The elongated footprint of the proposed extension would have a greater enclosing effect on the rear aspect of The Cottage, although the rising slope and the partly converging boundaries of the back garden contribute to an existing contained character. In some respects the proposal would not be dissimilar to the arrangement created by the converted barn to the front of the Farmhouse, albeit that was an older building and not attached to the Farmhouse.
13. Although the length and orientation of the proposed extension would change the relationship between the rear of the listed building and its outbuilding, the existing arrangement would remain legible. The combination of the slight step down in the proposed ridge, along with the lower eaves heights and the extension's situation set into the sloping garden would mean that the extension would have a subservient and more incidental, yet harmonious, relationship to the listed building as a whole and the two storey Cottage range in particular. Along with the treatment of fenestration, this would mean that the extension would not visually conflict with the main part of The Cottage which would remain discernible, as would the more substantive part of the listed building such that the evolution and character of the listed building would remain legible.
14. The design and materials of the proposal would also ensure that it would be assimilated into the relatively tightly knit group of traditional buildings at the heart of the village and WMCA.
15. The Council's somewhat ambiguous refusal reason that the proposal would result in *more than doubling the size in cumulative impacts* is imprecise as to what this is measured against and is not supported with any convincing evidence. I accept that in principle a situation may arise where a series of smaller extensions could incrementally lead to circumstances where alterations can harmfully overwhelm the more historic parts of a building. However, that situation would not occur with this proposal given its limited scale and footprint, and its situation relative to the older parts of the listed building considered overall, even when past alterations are taken into account.
16. Inside, the circulation space that exists in The Cottage element would not be altered thereby preserving the linear plan form in the older part of The Cottage. The new addition would be legible and understandable as a new addition from within and would not alter or interfere with that part of the listed building's significance it derives from a traditional linear plan form in The Cottage range.
17. It is unclear whether the Council's objections to cumulative effects extends to an unbuilt single storey laundry and WC extension that would project from the other end of The Cottage. The main parties agree that this could still be built as the result of extant permissions. I note that the appellant has no intention of building that extension, however the building may change hands and, in the absence of any mechanism being put forward that could prevent it being built, I have taken this into account.

18. However, the Council have not elaborated on what they consider the harmful effects on the significance of the listed building would be if both were implemented. It would not project as far as the appeal proposal but would provide a greater degree of enclosure to the rear elevation of the listed building if they were both built. Nevertheless, I have not found that enclosing effects to the rear of the building or changes to the overall floor plan of the listed building would be harmful as a result of the appeal proposal. Given that scheme's limited footprint and projection and the separation distance, it has not been demonstrated that were this earlier approval implemented as well as the appeal proposal that it would result in a cumulatively harmful effect. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the circumstances of an extant permission would not materially alter the effects that the separate proposal before me would have on the significance of either designated heritage asset.
19. I have given great weight to the conservation of both designated heritage assets. I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building and paid special attention to preserving the character and appearance of the WMCA. In doing so I have found that the proposal would preserve the listed building's special architectural and historic interest and would preserve the character and appearance of the WMCA. As I have not found harm to the significance of either designated heritage asset, the provisions of paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) are not engaged and the absence of public benefits of the proposal is not a material factor to consider.
20. The development, and insofar as they are relevant the works as well, would accord with the requirements of Purbeck Local Plan¹ Policies D and LHH. Together and amongst other criteria these require good design, use of locally distinctive materials, and the conservation of the historic environment and heritage assets.
21. As the extension would appear harmonious, and not overwhelm or compete, with the original building in terms of scale, detail, position or size and it would match the host building in terms of the quality and nature of materials, finishes and detailing, the proposal would accord with the Purbeck Design Guide's² principles for extensions to dwellings and listed buildings.

Other Matters

22. I have had regard to the purposes for which the Dorset National Landscape (formerly the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) is designated. For the above reasons, and also given the situation of the proposal set amongst the buildings of the village, the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the landscape qualities of the National Landscape and its natural beauty would be conserved. I note that the Council made a similar finding in this respect in their Householder Application Report.
23. Should the scheme proceed, the Council consider that the appellant should enter into a planning obligation to prevent the extension permissible under the extant permission from being implemented. However, for the reasons set out above it has not been demonstrated that harm to the designated heritage assets would result if both that and the appeal scheme were constructed. A

¹ Planning Purbeck's Future – Purbeck Local Plan Part 1, 2012.

² Purbeck district Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.

planning obligation would not therefore be necessary and the absence of one does not weigh against the proposal.

Conditions

24. As the proposal requires both planning permission and listed building consent, in this case it is not necessary to duplicate conditions relating to the preservation of the listed building on both decisions. It is necessary to attach a planning condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty for all parties. As the extension requires an element of excavation it is necessary to require details of surface water drainage to be approved to avoid flooding issues and it is necessary to approve the details of the retaining wall and associated hard landscaping in order to preserve the significance of the designated heritage assets.
25. An important aspect of the acceptability of the works will be the quality of materials and craftsmanship of the external surfaces and the specification of windows and doors. It is necessary that such details are approved and that a sample panel of materials is retained on site for reference. Interventions such as flues and vents have the potential to harm an otherwise sensitive scheme if poorly detailed or sited, as would inappropriately detailed rainwater goods. It is therefore necessary to specify the details of the latter and require details of the former to be approved prior to installation.

Conclusion

26. For the above reasons the development would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and would preserve the character and appearance of the WMCA. The development would accord with the development plan considered as a whole, the Framework and Council guidance. Similarly, the works would preserve the significance of the listed building and WMCA. Appeals A and B are therefore allowed.

Geoff Underwood

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULES OF CONDITIONS

Planning Permission, Ref P/HOU/2023/00083

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 20/286/01 and 20/386/02 Rev E.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until a surface water drainage scheme shall have been carried out in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority beforehand.
- 4) No development shall take place above damp-proof course level until a scheme of hard landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details, of finished ground levels, the retaining wall, hard surfacing, materials and

any retained historic landscape features. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme before the development hereby permitted is first brought into use.

Listed Building Consent, Ref P/LBC/2023/00084

- 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
- 2) No works shall commence until a sample panel of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces shall have been prepared on site for inspection and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The sample panel shall be at least 2m² and show the proposed palette of materials, coursing or bond, pointing technique and finish of those materials. The works shall be constructed in accordance with the approved sample panel, which shall not be removed from the site until completion of the works.
- 3) No works shall commence until full details of all windows, roof lights and doors shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Those details shall include full vertical and horizontal cross section details of the proposed windows at 1:5 scale or larger to include details of glazing bars, glazing and means of fixing, frame, sill and depth of reveal. The rooflights shall be top hung metal conservation type rooflights with a vertical glazing bar and fitted flush to the roof plane. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) All new and replacement rainwater goods shall be constructed of half round profile gutters and round section down pipes, in cast metal, with a painted finish. Guttering is to be fixed by rise and fall brackets with no fascia board fitted.
- 5) No external extracts, flues, vents, heating or cooling equipment, sensors or lighting, or similar paraphernalia shall be installed unless and until full details, including their illustration on drawings, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

*** end of schedules of conditions ***