



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 5 August 2025

by **R E Jones BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/U3935/W/24/3354239

Globe Inn, 7 Sheep Street, Highworth, Swindon SN6 7AA

- 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 Dr Colin Hislop against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is S/23/1157/AMMY.
 - The development proposed is conversion of a public house to a single private dwelling involving internal and external alterations, restoration of historic fabric and thermal enhancements, demolition and replacement of rear single storey extension, conversion of single storey rear outbuilding, addition of rear dormer window and external landscape works.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/U3935/Y/24/3354246

Globe Inn, 7 Sheep Street, Highworth, Swindon SN6 7AA

- 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 Dr Colin Hislop against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is S/LBC/23/1158/AMMY.
 - The works proposed are conversion of a public house to a single private dwelling involving internal and external alterations, restoration of historic fabric and thermal enhancements, demolition and replacement of rear single storey extension, conversion of single storey rear outbuilding, addition of rear dormer window and external landscape works.
-

Decision

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

Procedural Matter

3. As the proposal is in a conservation area and relates to a listed building, I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act).
4. The two appeals concern the same scheme under different, complementary legislation. I have dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on: the special interest of a Grade II listed building, No 7 Sheep Street; the setting of a Grade II listed building, No 6 Sheep Street; and the character and appearance of the Highworth Conservation Area.

Reasons

Special interest and significance

6. The appeal property, No 7 Sheep Street (No 7), is a grade II listed former public house, situated within a largely commercial frontage facing Highworth's historic market place. The building like others in the row sits within a long and narrow parcel of land, strongly suggesting its origins as a burgage plot. These plots typically have a larger primary building at the front and a linear sequence of later buildings and/or additions at the rear housing residential or commercial uses.
7. The list entry¹ dates the building to the 19th century, although there is evidence of a dwelling house at the site since the late 17th century. Comprising two and a half storeys, No 7 has a painted rendered front elevation and a stone slate roof with 2 gabled dormers. Despite some alterations to the fenestration, the front of the building has maintained its architectural form and features and is consistent with the scale and aesthetic qualities of the other frontage buildings.
8. At the rear there is a subordinate two storey rubble extension with stone slate roof and a further single storey tiled extension emanating from that. Both are likely to be mid-19th century additions and face onto a rear passageway. A more modern brick, single storey flat roof toilet block addition emanates from the rear wall of the original building. The brick exterior and the timber balustrading enclosing the flat roof above, detract from the more historic rear additions, as does the external entrance door. However, this extension is modest in height and depth and largely allows for the historic fabric of the rear elevation of the original building and the evolution of the subsequent additions emanating from it to be observed.
9. The adjoining property, No 6 Sheep Street, is also grade II listed. The frontage, comprises two and a half storeys, painted brick walls, a stone tiled roof and two gabled dormers. At the rear there are several historic additions extending from the main back wall and running along the boundary of No 7. Given the depth of its curtilage and the arrangement and appearance of those later additions, it is highly likely that No 6 also originated as one of several burgage plots within this part of Sheep Street.
10. The site is located within the Highworth Conservation Area (CA). This area includes a high concentration of listed buildings that are grouped primarily around the town's church and historic market place. I saw during my site visit that the buildings have an aesthetically pleasing quality derived from their consistent scale, arrangement and architectural detail. Many of the buildings are positioned within burgage plots as evidenced by their long and narrow form and the presence of secondary additions and/or ranges emanating from the primary frontage buildings.
11. From the evidence before me, No 7's special interest and significance are largely derived from its historical and architectural interest. Its historic interest primarily derives from its age, former use as an inn and its origins as a burgage plot. While its architectural interest mainly stems from its attractive form, and the contribution it makes to the harmonious composition of the wider townscape, the legibility of its historic fabric and the coherent hierarchy of structures within the plot.

¹ List Entry Number: 1185029

12. Insofar as it relates to the CA, No 7 is an integral element of a large group of listed buildings that make a positive contribution to the historic charm of Highworth's townscape, while its evidential value as one of many burgage plots, in part, informs the historic settlement pattern of the CA.
13. The adjoining listed building at No 6 also derives some significance from having No 7 within its immediate setting through its mutual association as a historic burgage plot. It also displays, like No 7, a clear hierarchy and arrangement of additions emanating from the main principal building which reinforces its historical appearance and function.

Appeal proposal and effects

14. The rear brick, single storey flat roof addition and the timber balustrading above would be removed. It would be replaced with a proposed two storey flat roof extension. The extension's ground floor would have a similar profile and depth to the existing brick addition; however, its rear elevation would primarily be glazed with grey metal windows and doors. The first floor above would comprise a flat roof with a shorter projection from the principal rear wall to accommodate a balcony. The proposed first floor element would partly infill the void between the two storey gabled extensions emanating from the rear principal elevations of the appeal building and No 6 Sheep Street, while marginally rising above their respective eaves line. The first-floor elevation would primarily be glazed with some horizontal timber cladding either side. A clear glass balustrade would enclose the balcony. The first-floor element would provide access onto the balcony and contain a new internal staircase and gallery.
15. A new doorway leading from the remodelled front bedroom suite would open onto the first-floor gallery and staircase enclosed by the new extension. This intervention would require breaking through the rubble stonework that forms the rear wall of the original building. A further opening would be created off the first floor gallery into a remodelled landing area. This would also require the removal of rubble stonework from the side wall of the 19th century rear two storey gable addition.
16. The introduction of a double storey, flat roof extension up against the principal rear wall of the appeal building would appreciably obscure the visibility of the original rubble stonework, particularly at first floor level. Moreover, the creation of new internal openings would result in a further loss of the original outer wall at the rear and part of the side wall of the rear gable addition. These alterations would significantly harm the legibility and integrity of the building's historic fabric. Furthermore, the boxlike profile, use of contemporary materials and the higher roof line of the extension, relative to the eaves of the adjoining double storey gables, would unsettle the clear hierarchy and arrangement of the additions that emanate from the rear elevation of the appeal building, as well as No 6. This unsympathetic integration into the historic fabric of the building would harm the building's layout and narrative.
17. Furthermore, the proposed extension's proximity to No 6 would display an awkward juxtaposition with the legible arrangement of historic additions extending from its rear. For this reason, the proposed extension would fail to preserve the setting of No 6, insofar as it contributes to its significance as a listed building.

18. It is acknowledged that the ground floor portion of the glazed extension would replace the existing brick addition which has a heavier and more discordant presence. It would also be more subservient and recessive when seen in context with the rear principal wall and projecting ranges. Yet I have assessed the proposed rear extension as a whole, rather than the ground floor portion in isolation, and for the reasons given I consider that the cumulative scale and appearance would be harmful.
19. From within the CA I observed that the proposed first floor extension and balcony would be visible from the permissive thoroughfare running along the boundary of Malt House and Lease House, which connects Cherry Orchard to Sheep Street. From this perspective the legibility of the appeal site and adjoining properties (including No 6) as burgage plots can be appreciated. Although views would be somewhat angled and fleeting, the height, shape and contemporary design, of the proposed rear extension would be jarring when seen from the thoroughfare and thus capable of harming both the wider character and appearance of the CA.
20. The removal of the existing, brick single storey rear extension and timber panelling above would undoubtedly have a positive effect on the appearance of No 7. I also recognise that large areas of glazing in extensions allow for greater permeability that can reduce the sense of massing. However, extensions should also attempt to successfully integrate with the host building, but in this case the height, shape and use of materials would be significantly at odds with the aesthetic and historical qualities of No 7.
21. Moreover, I am unconvinced that the large areas of glazing on the ground and first floors would positively reveal the original rear wall of the building as the presence of furniture, decoration, the internal stair and balustrade, and general activity within the building would significantly obscure views and an understanding of the building's original form.
22. Similarly, the creation of a formal balcony area at first floor level, whilst not possibly as intrusive as the existing timber parapet and fire escape ladder on the existing flat roof, would likely be associated with other items such as chairs, parasols or planting, in addition to the activity of people. This would further obscure views of the original fabric of the rear wall of No 7. It would be difficult to control activity and paraphernalia by condition, given the nature of a roof terrace being to allow leisure access.
23. The appellant indicates that there was some support from the Council's Conservation Officer regarding a largely glazed extension, in advice given on an earlier scheme². However, that related to a single storey extension which would not have the same effect on the proposal as the much taller appeal extension.
24. The appellant considers that the scheme would secure the optimum viable use of the listed building. However, the conversion of the building to a dwelling could be achieved through a more sympathetic proposal which would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the heritage asset. Similarly, the new internal stairway in the proposed two storey rear extension would not be the only way to access the first floor of the building, and its conversion, to a dwelling, would not be dependent solely on that configuration.

² S/14/1438 and S/LBC/14/1439 - construction of a single-storey rear extension and the conversion of an outbuilding to a kitchen (including the installation of new kitchen extraction duct), approved 2014

25. Although not indicated in the Council's refusal reason, the officer reports states there would be further harm to the historic fabric of No 7 arising from the removal of partition walls within first floor rooms. However, from my inspection of the building those partitions are modern in appearance and construction and therefore likely to be more recent interventions, rather than part of the 19th century internal fabric as indicated by the Council. The removal of those walls would not, in my view, harm any significant or important parts of the building's fabric. Therefore, in relation to those works the special architectural and historic interest of the building would be preserved.
26. Notwithstanding my earlier concerns, the proposed repair, replacement and restoration of windows, doors, chimneys, staircases and timber beams in a manner sympathetic to the listed building would all positively conserve and improve its historic fabric. As to would the reinstatement of lost period features such as the ground floor fireplace and the removal of elements that detract from the significance of the listed building, including the rear brick, flat roof extension. Other benefits would include improvements to the building's insulation and works that would enhance its weather proofing. These would, of themselves, sustain and enhance the listed building and preserve the character and appearance of the CA in which it sits and contribute to their long-term conservation. Further consideration will be given to these benefits in the final balance section below.
27. The Council did not have any concerns regarding the provision of a new rear dormer, rooflights, the re-modelling and extension of the rear store building, the provision of a timber enclosure to store bicycles, refuse and utilities, and a garden arbor. There was also no objection in principle to the change of use of the property to a residential dwelling. Having regard to the appearance and scale of those proposed changes I have no reason to disagree with the Council. Nevertheless, a lack of harm in this regard does not amount to a consideration in support of the appeals.
28. Drawing all the above together, the proposed two storey rear extension would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building, No 7 Sheep Street. It would also harm the significance of the Grade II listed building, No 6 Sheep Street, through development affecting its setting, as well as causing harm to the character and appearance of the CA. This would be contrary to the requirements of sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Act.

Public benefits and balance

29. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework, (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to their conservation. Paragraph 213 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting and that this should have clear and convincing justification.
30. With reference to Paragraphs 214 and 215 of the Framework, in finding harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. The extent of the development and works, where I have found harm, would be relatively localised and at the rear, less public elevation, of the building. Therefore, I find the harm to the heritage assets to be 'less than substantial' and at the lower end of that spectrum in this instance but, nevertheless, of considerable

importance and weight. Under such circumstances, Paragraph 215 advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes securing the asset's optimum viable use.

31. Heritage benefits would accrue from the removal of harmful features; the reinstatement of lost partitions and period features; the general repair and restoration of the building; and the property's long-term use as a single family dwelling that would replace an unviable use. There would be some economic benefits brought about through the investment into the property and the construction phase. Also, social benefits would be gained through improvements to the local housing stock and the provision of a new dwelling within a sustainable town centre location in proximity of facilities and services. These public benefits are in line with the objectives of the Framework and carry moderate weight in favour of the appeal.
32. Overall, the moderate weight that I ascribe to the public benefits which would accrue from the proposal is not sufficient to outweigh the considerable importance and weight that I attach to the harm I have found.
33. Therefore, there would be insufficient public benefit to offset the identified harm and the development and works indicated do not accord with the Framework. I therefore conclude that the proposal fails to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the grade II listed building at No 7 Sheep Street, the significance of the grade II listed building, No 6 Sheep Street, through development affecting its setting, and would harm the wider character and appearance of the CA, which I am required to have special regard and pay special attention to by the Act. The proposal would also conflict with Policies DE1 and EN10 of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2026 (adopted 26th March 2015) (the Local Plan). Together these require, amongst other things, that proposals conserve the significance of heritage assets and acknowledge features of importance.
34. The Council's refusal reason refers to Policy 8 of the Highworth Neighbourhood Plan 2015-2026 (Final Version March 2017). That policy is not relevant in the context of the main issues as it relates to maintaining and enhancing community facilities. Accordingly, I have not referred to it in my finding, above. Similarly, I have not referred to Policy EN5 of the Local Plan, as this relates to landscape considerations, which are not relevant to the main issues.

Other Matters

35. The adjoining property, No 8 Sheep Street, is also a grade II listed building. It sits within the same frontage as the appeal site and No 6 and exhibits evidence as a former burgage plot. In line with section 66(1) of the Act, I have paid special regard to the desirability of preserving that building's setting.
36. The proposed development and works would not be clearly seen in context with the rear elevation of No 8 as the combined depth of the rear additions emanating from the principal rear wall of the appeal building would effectively screen views of the proposed changes, such that there would be no harm to the setting of No 8, insofar as it contributes to its significance.
37. Therefore, I consider that the proposal would have a neutral effect on No 8, and would therefore preserve, the special architectural and historic interest which it possesses. As such, the proposal would not harm the significance of this

designated heritage asset. I note that the Council did not object in these respects either. Nevertheless, this weighs neither for, nor against the appeals and does not alter my conclusion on the main issues.

Conclusion

38. **Appeal A:** The proposed development would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations which indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed.
39. **Appeal B:** For the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal B should be dismissed.

RE Jones

INSPECTOR