



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 17 March 2025

by Neil Pope BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 March 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/U1105/W/24/3357937

Pyms, Poltimore, Exeter, Devon, EX4 0AA.

- 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 Mr and Mrs Campain against the decision of East Devon District Council.
- The application reference is 24/0592/FUL.
- The development proposed is the demolition of conservatory and garage replaced with adjoining rear extension and detached bike store and alterations to a front boundary wall with gate and parking.

Appeal B Ref: APP/U1105/Y/24/3357936

Pyms, Poltimore, Exeter, Devon, EX4 0AA.

- 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 Mr and Mrs Campain against the decision of East Devon District Council.
- The application reference is 24/0593/LBC.
- The works proposed are the demolition of conservatory and garage replaced with adjoining rear extension and detached bike store and alterations to a front boundary wall with gate and parking.

Decisions

1. The appeals are allowed. Planning permission and listed building consent are granted for the demolition of conservatory and garage, replaced with adjoining rear extension and detached bike store and alterations to a front boundary wall with gate and parking at Pyms, Poltimore, Exeter, Devon, EX4 0AA. The permission and consent are granted in accordance with the terms of the respective applications references 24/0592/FUL and 24/0593/LBC and subject to the conditions in the Schedules below.

Preliminary Matters

2. Pyms is a grade II listed building¹.
3. Prior to the Council's determination of the applications the proposals were amended² and revised plans were submitted for consideration. I have determined these appeals on the basis of the plans listed within the Council's decision notices.
4. The concerns set out within the Council's decision notices are limited to the proposed rear extension³. Within its Statement, there is some ambiguity in the Council's position regarding the proposed infilling on the front boundary wall. However, there is no cogent evidence with its Statement or officer's report to demonstrate any harm arising from such works. This and the other 'incidental'

¹ The provisions of sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 are engaged.

² Amongst other things, this included omitting the addition of solar panels on the roof of the proposed rear extension and a reduction in the 'footprint', eaves and ridge heights of the proposed extension. Whilst the appellants' Statement refers to a slate roof on the bike shed, the submitted plans are annotated "*corrugated metal sheet to match extension*". Although natural slates would also be appropriate, I have determined the appeals on the basis of the details shown on the submitted plans.

³ The Government's Planning Practice Guidance, amongst other things, requires local planning authorities when refusing permission to state clearly and precisely the full reasons for refusal.

elements of the proposals would preserve the special architectural and historic qualities of Pyms. I shall therefore frame the main issue accordingly.

Main Issue (Both Appeals)

5. The main issue is whether the proposed rear extension would preserve the special architectural or historic qualities of the grade II listed building known as Pyms.

Reasons

6. The heritage interest (significance) of Pyms is primarily derived from its special architectural and historic qualities. These include: its cob and painted rendered walls; hipped thatched roof; sizeable chimney stacks; original one-room deep plan form with central passage (the dwelling was formerly a pair of cottages); 18th century doors; 19th century windows and; as a surviving record of late 17th or early 18th century rural labourers' cottages built in the Devon vernacular.
7. Pyms has been altered and extended over time. This includes 19th century single storey additions to the rear, some 20th century additions/alterations (including a rear bedroom, projecting mono-pitched roadside garage and some replacement windows) and a sizeable conservatory that was approved in 2005 (refs. 05/0659/FUL and 05/0667/LBC). The 20th century additions/alterations do not contribute to the significance of this listed building. Furthermore, I agree with the appellants' heritage consultant that the design of the conservatory, which appears to have been intended to emulate a glasshouse or orangery, is somewhat grandiose for modest rural labourers' cottages and is rather ill-fitting⁴.
8. The proposed rear extension would involve the demolition of the 19th century stone stores at the rear of the cottage, as well as the loss of some 19th century fabric from the eastern wall of the cottage to create an internal access into a glazed link to the proposed kitchen/dining/family room. The loss of these historic stores and 19th century fabric would be unfortunate and, to a limited extent, would erode the historic significance of Pyms. However, it is proposed to re-use any suitable stone arising from these works in the proposed north east elevation of the extension and a new section of roadside wall. This would enable some of this historic fabric to be retained in structures elsewhere on site. I note that in refusing permission/consent the Council has not identified this as a matter of concern.
9. As noted above, the Council's concerns (as set out within its reasons for refusal) are limited to the scale and mass of the proposed kitchen/dining/family room. This rear extension would be a sizeable addition⁵ to the listed cottage. However, it would be in a similar position to the existing stores and conservatory. With the demolition of the garage, which would remove an unsympathetic addition at the side and slightly in front of the cottage and enhance its roadside appearance, there would be a net reduction in floorspace⁶.
10. The proposed rear extension would be set well back from the principal roadside elevation of the cottage. Although it would be taller than the existing conservatory and the apex of the new roof would be above the eaves height of the cottage, it would be very much lower than the roof ridge of Pyms. This new extension would

⁴ Whilst the Council has argued that different policies were in play at that time, the statutory duty was the same. It has not been demonstrated that the development plan policies in 2005 were more permissive of this style of conservatory.

⁵ On behalf of the appellants, it has been calculated that this extension would have a floor area of 45m².

⁶ On behalf of the appellants, it has been calculated that the garage, stores and conservatory have a combined floor area of 53m².

also be designed with its roof ridge running perpendicular to the road⁷ and have a steeply sloping pitched roof. When viewed from the roadside, this would provide adequate space/separation between the hip roof of the cottage and the proposed kitchen/dining/family room.

11. The mass of the proposed extension would also be broken by the sizeable glazed areas, including the full height glazing within the zinc flat roofed link. The proposed use of corrugated metal roof material and timber cladding on the roadside elevation, which are materials found within the Devon countryside⁸, would also give the extension a contemporary and 'lightweight' appearance. This would ensure that it did not vie with or dominate the vernacular or other special qualities of the cottage. The proposed extension would not appear as a bulky or inappropriate addition to the listed building. It would provide more useable habitable space⁹ for the appellants and their children and would comprise a sympathetic and further stage in the 'evolution' of this historic dwelling. The appellants' architect has given thoughtful consideration to designing an extension that would meet modern standards of living whilst respecting the integrity of Pym's.
12. When the loss of historic stores and fabric that I have identified above is considered in the overall context of the proposals, including the benefits to be derived from securing the removal of a poorly designed garage and a rather ill-fitting conservatory, as well as the provision of enhanced off-road parking and turning for vehicles, a charging point for electric vehicles and more useable habitable space to assist in furthering the residential use of this designated heritage asset, the proposals would preserve the special architectural and historic qualities of Pym's. In so doing, there would be no conflict with the provisions of policies EN8 or EN9 of the East Devon Local Plan (2013-2031)¹⁰.

Conditions

13. In addition to the 'standard' conditions requiring development/works to commence within three years, for the avoidance of doubt it would be necessary to attach conditions specifying the approved plans. To safeguard the integrity of the listed building, it would also be necessary to attach conditions requiring further details of some of the proposed works and ensure that the proposed flue did not project above the roof ridge. Some details suggested by the Council would be unnecessary and I have modified the proposed conditions accordingly. In respect of appeal A only and to safeguard the character and appearance of the area, a condition would be necessary requiring further details of the proposed landscaping/screen fence.

Conclusion

14. Given all of the above and having regard to all other matter raised, I conclude that these appeals should succeed.

Neil Pope

Inspector

⁷ The roof ridge of the conservatory runs parallel to the road.

⁸ The roof of the 19th century stores comprises corrugated metal sheeting.

⁹ The access to the conservatory is somewhat unsatisfactory/inconvenient and I understand that this space is poorly insulated.

¹⁰ The provisions of section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 do not apply in respect of appeal B.

SCHEDULES OF CONDITIONS

Appeal A – Planning Permission

1. The development hereby permitted shall commence within three years of the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in accordance with the following approved drawings: 1:1,250 scale location plan (ref. 1-0001); 1:100 scale proposed elevations, floor plan and roof plan and 1:200 scale proposed site plan (ref. 0-0002 Rev D); 1:100 scale proposed bike store (ref. 0-0003 Rev B) and; 1:100 scale context elevations (ref. 2-0001 Rev C).
3. Prior to the construction/installation of the relevant works, details of the colours of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority: the corrugated metal roof sheeting to be used on the roofs of the proposed kitchen/dining /family room and bike store; the proposed zinc roof canopy; the new timber cladding; new external doors and window frames and; the new metal rainwater goods. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
4. The new areas of external stonework shall comprise natural stone either reclaimed from existing outbuildings and walls on the site, or natural stone from elsewhere to match the colour, form and texture of the existing natural stone on the site. The new areas of stonework shall be laid to match the style of the existing natural stonework on the site and shall include a lime mortar with a stippled surface so as not to stand proud of the joints.
5. As shown on the approved plans, the new flue/lead pipe to be inserted into the thatch on the rear roof slope of the cottage shall not project above the roof ridge.
6. Prior to the use of the proposed vehicular access and parking area or the relocation of the oil storage tank or the construction of the bike shed, details of the proposed landscape planting (including the type, number and size of plants/shrubs to be planted, as well as a timetable for planting) and the screen fence shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Appeal B – Listed Building Consent

1. The works hereby permitted shall commence within three years of the date of this decision.
2. The works hereby permitted shall be undertaken in accordance with the following approved drawings: 1:1,250 scale location plan (ref. 1-0001); 1:100 scale proposed elevations, floor plan and roof plan and 1:200 scale proposed site plan (ref. 0-0002 Rev D); 1:100 scale proposed bike store (ref. 0-0003 Rev B) and; 1:100 scale context elevations (ref. 2-0001 Rev C).
3. Prior to the construction/installation of the relevant works, details of the colours of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority: the corrugated metal roof sheeting to be used on the roofs of the

proposed kitchen/dining /family room and bike store; the proposed zinc roof canopy; the new timber cladding; new external doors and window frames and; the new metal rainwater goods. The works shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

4. The new areas of external stonework shall comprise natural stone either reclaimed from existing outbuildings and walls on the site, or natural stone from elsewhere to match the colour, form and texture of the existing natural stone on the site. The new areas of stonework shall be laid to match the style of the existing natural stonework on the site and shall include a lime mortar with a stippled surface so as not to stand proud of the joints.
5. As shown on the approved plans, the new lead pipe and collar to be inserted into the thatch on the rear roof slope of the cottage shall not project above the roof ridge.