



---

## Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 2 October 2024

**by A Dawe BSc (Hons), MSc, MPhil, MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 24 October 2024**

---

### **Appeal A Ref: APP/Y3940/W/24/3347642**

#### **Yew Tree Cottage, 25 High Street, Manton, Wiltshire SN8 4HH**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Miss Hilary Grandison against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
  - The application Ref is PL/2024/00933.
  - The development proposed is to partially rebuild the rear extension.
- 

### **Appeal B Ref: APP/Y3940/Y/24/3347641**

#### **Yew Tree Cottage, 25 High Street, Manton, Wiltshire SN8 4HH**

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
  - The appeal is made by Miss Hilary Grandison against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
  - The application Ref is PL/2024/01187.
  - The works proposed are the same as for Appeal A.
- 

## **Decisions**

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted to partially rebuild the rear extension at Yew Tree Cottage, 25 High Street, Manton, Wiltshire SN8 4HH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2024/00933, subject to the following conditions:
  - i) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - ii) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos. 1633-02 Revision A and 1633-03, except in respect of the indicative red lines shown on drawing no. 1633-03.
  - iii) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the proposed materials and finishes as set out in the application form for planning permission.
2. Appeal B is allowed and listed building consent is granted to partially rebuild the rear extension at Yew Tree Cottage, 25 High Street, Manton, Wiltshire SN8 4HH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2024/01187, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
  - i) The works authorised by this consent shall commence not later than three years from the date of this consent.
  - ii) The external surfaces of the works authorised by this consent shall be constructed in the proposed materials and finishes as set out in the application form for listed building consent.

### **Procedural matter**

3. I have sought confirmation from the main parties as to the plans upon which the Council made its decision and that are intended to form the basis of my decisions. For both appeals, the Council has confirmed that its decision was based on drawing no. 1633-02 Revision A and not drawing no. 1633-02. I note that drawing no. 1633-03, titled 'detailed floor plan and sections', was also submitted by the Appellant, which the Council has no objection to being included in the plans determined under this appeal. That drawing 1633-03, as well as including the proposal, also shows an indication with red lines of where a higher roof would be positioned which, for clarity, I have not determined as being part of the proposal. I have determined the appeals and come to both of my decisions on that basis.

### **Main Issue**

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the significance of the Grade II listed building known as 25 Manton High Street (Ref: 1365435) (the LB), and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

### **Reasons**

5. The LB derives its significance from it being a C17<sup>th</sup>/C18<sup>th</sup> century timber-framed and brick two-storey house, including its thatched roof, and colour washed brick nogging on the front elevation together with two ranges of casement windows with glazing bars.
6. The LB has a modern brick and oak framed, single storey rear extension of no historic significance in itself. That extension has a very gently sloping, standing seamed metal flat roof and includes a single, modest sized, raised rooflight which is not shown on the submitted existing plans. That extension covers a large proportion of the LBs historic rear elevation. Nevertheless, a significant amount of that historic elevation remains visible either externally, or internally from within the extension and from the immediate outside area via the glazing to what is annotated on the plans as a dining room.
7. I understand from the Appellant that the existing extension is failing in terms of water tightness, with 'flat roof rot' in the metal roof, and movement and cracking of its timber framing. Whilst I saw some evidence of cracked timber frame and a small amount of damp staining, the extent to which that was symptomatic of the claimed failure was unclear, particularly as I was unable to see most of the metal roof, which was covered with a protective tarpaulin.
8. The proposed extension would largely replace the existing one and be of similar size and dimensions, albeit slightly higher and squared off at the rear, other than a small, staggered corner section. The existing dining room area would therefore extend out a little further albeit still level with the current rear bathroom elevation. The extension would utilise modern materials, including Sarnafil roofing system and three new raised rooflights replacing that existing; brickwork on one side to match that being retained on the other, with high level windows; and powder coated aluminium framed glazing doors across the entire rear elevation.

9. The proposed roofing, based on the submissions would have a similar appearance as the existing metal, albeit appearing not to include standing seams. Whilst a modern material, it would be in the context of that existing metal roof itself not being a characteristic feature of the original LB and not having any historic significance in that context. Furthermore, there is no substantive evidence to indicate that the system proposed is of a lesser quality than that on the existing roof. In that context, regardless as to whether or not a new metal roof could be satisfactorily installed and still address the claimed current failings, it is unlikely that the proposed material would have a significantly different effect on the LB's special interest than that existing.
10. The presence of three raised rooflights would be noticeably more prominent than that existing. Nevertheless, they would still be set apart from the original rear elevation of the LB and the existing first floor window and no higher than the eaves level of the main house. As such, the lines and extent of exposure of the existing rear elevation externally would not be affected to any significantly greater degree than is currently the case.
11. The proposed extension would not include any oak framing, unlike that existing which would be replaced with a combination of brick and modern framed glazed doors and windows. However, again, that is in the context of the modern nature of the existing extension, including in terms of its brickwork and evenly edged and finished oak frames. The extent of rear elevation glazing would also be likely to lighten the appearance of the proposal in the context of the LB as a whole, notwithstanding the additional brickwork on the west elevation compared with that existing.
12. The proposal would include a small, staggered section at one of its corners that would break its otherwise regular appearance to a small degree. However, the small scale of that element, together with use of the same brick as in the rest of the extension, would ensure that it would not be a dominant or detracting feature in the context of the proposal or LB as a whole. It would also not be an unusual feature in the context of the existing extension which has a staggered rear elevation albeit not at the corner point.
13. In light of the above, the proposal would preserve the significance of the LB and features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses. The proposal would therefore satisfy the requirements of sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act). Furthermore, for the same reasons, the proposal would accord with Core Policies 57 and 58 of the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy which require, amongst other things, that new development be sympathetic to and conserve historic buildings; the use of high standards of building materials and finishes; and that designated heritage assets and their settings will be conserved, and where appropriate enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance. The proposal would also accord with paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework which highlights, amongst other things, the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets.

## **Conditions**

14. The Council has not suggested any conditions in the event of the appeals being allowed. However, for certainty, I have included the standard time limit condition. For clarity, I have also included a condition highlighting the approved plans, but only for Appeal A. Although those plans relate to both

appeals, I have not imposed a similar condition in relation to Appeal B as there is no power to do so under the Act. Also, for clarity and in the interests of preserving the significance of the LB, I have included a condition for both appeals to ensure that the proposal is carried out in accordance with the proposed materials and finishes set out in the respective original application forms.

### **Conclusion**

15. For the reasons given above both appeals should be allowed.

*A Dawe*

INSPECTOR