
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 24 April 2025

by J P Longmuir BA(Hons) DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th August 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/P1133/W/24/3349529

Wren Cottage, Track heading north from Connybear Cross, Haccombe, Newton Abbot, TQ12 4SJ

- 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 Mark Beattie against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01403/HOU.
 - The development proposed is single storey 'garden room' extension to the south west elevation.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/P1133/Y/24/3349531

Wren Cottage, Track heading north from Connybear Cross, Haccombe, Newton Abbot, TQ12 4SJ

- 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 Mark Beattie against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01404/LBC.
 - The works proposed are single storey 'garden room' extension to the south west elevation.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A: the appeal is dismissed.
2. Appeal B: the appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeals concern works and development at the Grade II listed Wren Cottage¹. The list description suggests it was originally the lodge to the nearby Haccombe House.
4. Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) require special regard is given to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. I am also mindful of the historic environment policies within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that relate to the significance of designated heritage assets and their settings and the Planning Practice Guidance on the Historic environment.

¹ List Entry Number: 1168303

Main Issue

5. The main issue in both appeals is whether the proposed works and development would preserve the Grade II Wren Cottage listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is at the end of a single width track on a verdant partially wooded hillside. There is a public right of way to one side, although the Cottage is partly obscured by vegetation. The main house is one and half storeys high and there is a single storey extension to the side.
7. The special interest and significance of the building is largely derived from its thatched roof, with three dormer windows and hipped ends.
8. The rear garden provides the immediate setting for the Cottage as the buildings form an arc around one side and the windows face onto it. The adjacent hillside also forms part of its setting. These settings contribute to the rustic charm of the Cottage.
9. The proposed extension would be to the side and single storey, which in both respects, would be subservient to the listed building. However, the proposal has a flat roof which would appear at odds with the otherwise soft gently undulating thatched roofscape. I note the elliptical shape proposed, but the flat roof would nonetheless appear abrupt and overly assertive, thereby spoiling the cohesion of the architecture.
10. Whilst the extension would be a contemporary break from the historic structure, they would be experienced together, and the roofline would be detracting. In addition, the submission notes the proposal would join a relatively recent extension², but this is thatched and compliments the original building.
11. I therefore find that the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the listed building and a high point within that spectrum.
12. Policy EN5 of the Teignbridge Local Plan seeks to protect and enhance the areas heritage, including listed buildings. Policy S2 requires new development to be high quality, and where designs integrate and enhance heritage assets. The proposal would be in conflict.

Heritage and Planning Balances

13. Whilst the harm arising would be less than substantial; however, Paragraph 212 of the Framework advocates great weight to the asset's conservation. I therefore give considerable importance and weight to the harm I have identified in my balancing judgment below. In addition, Paragraph 213 of the Framework emphasises that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, should require clear and convincing justification.
14. Paragraph 215 directs that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including where appropriate securing its optimum viable use.

² Circa 1995

15. The extension would provide additional space for the occupants, contributing to their everyday living conditions and improving the housing stock. In addition, the proposed glazing would also allow good daylighting, contributing to energy saving and well-being.
16. However, taking the public benefits together as a whole, I conclude that they would not be of sufficient weight to outweigh the high level of harm within the less than substantial spectrum identified to the significance and special interest of the designated heritage asset.
17. As the proposal would harm the listed building it would be contrary to Policies EN5 and S2.
18. I consider that the proposed works and development would fail to preserve the setting and special architectural or historic interest of the Grade II listed building. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
19. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Paragraph 11(c) of the Framework states that decision taking means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay. In respect of Appeal A, the proposal would be contrary to the Development Plan when taken as a whole and material considerations do not indicate the proposals should be approved.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

John Longmuir

INSPECTOR