



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 19 August 2025

by Juliet Rogers BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/E3335/W/25/3362858

Haselbury House Wing, Swan Hill, Haselbury Plucknett, Crewkerne, Somerset TA18 7RA

- 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 Kenneth Prunty against the decision of Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/03064/HOU.
 - The development proposed is an extension to form a utility room, the refurbishment of an existing outbuilding and the construction of a link porch between the main house and the outbuilding.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/E3335/Y/24/3344036

Haselbury House Wing, Swan Hill, Haselbury Plucknett, Crewkerne, Somerset TA18 7RA

- 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 Kenneth Prunty against the decision of Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/03065/LBC.
 - The works proposed are as per Appeal A.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The preparation of the new Somerset Local Plan has commenced following the creation of Somerset Council. As the emerging plan has not reached publication stage no policies have been put forward as relevant to the determination of this case. In the meantime, the South Somerset Local Plan (the Local Plan) remains in place. Consequently, I have determined this appeal in accordance with it and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
4. As the site comprises a listed building, I have had regard to sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act).

Main Issue

5. The main issues for both appeals are whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed buildings known as Haselbury Wing¹ and the Former Stable Block²

¹ List entry: 1056121 – Haselbury House, and Haselbury Wing, and north and east boundary railings, date first listed: 19 April 1961

² List entry: 1366447 – Former Stable Block about 5 metres south west of Haselbury House Wind, date first listed: 19 April 1961

or their settings or any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that they possess.

Reasons

6. Although the property known as Haselbury Wing is now a separate dwelling, it previously functioned as service accommodation associated with the attached Haselbury House and as part of a larger estate. Whilst various additions and repair works have been undertaken, including the construction of a conservatory, the property retains a subservience to Haselbury House. Therefore, in combination with the use of local stone, the special interest of Haselbury Wing, insofar as is relevant to the appeal scheme, relates to its historic service function associated with Haselbury House and the wider estate.
7. The single storey outbuilding on the site which forms part of the Former Stable Block, comprises three compact rooms currently used as a workshop, utility room and for domestic storage, with the remainder of the listed building having been converted to a dwelling under separate ownership. Although displaying few historic features and having undergone much modification, nonetheless, the outbuilding forms part of the official listing. Furthermore, the scale, simple form and separation of the outbuilding from Haselbury House and Haselbury Wing on the other side of the historic driveway off Swan Hill, albeit shortened, ensures its ancillary role within the context of the former estate. Its special interest, therefore, remains appreciable.
8. Given their proximity and historical relationship as part of a wider estate, the entirety of each of the Grade II listed buildings contribute to the setting of the other which, in turn, positively contributes to their special interest and their group value.
9. Although designed to provide corridor access from the dwelling to the outbuilding, the depth of the proposed link would be similar to the width of the proposed sitting room. As a result of its scale and higher eaves level to the existing lean-to and outbuilding structures, the proposed link would not be subservient to Haselbury Wing. Moreover, the appreciation of the physical and functional separation between the existing structures would be lost. Whilst it has been designed to be read as a more contemporary addition to the property, the link would, therefore, be an incongruous and unsympathetic feature attached to two heritage assets. It would also result in a dilution of their hierarchical relationship within the context of the former estate and further shorten the route of the historic driveway off Swan Hill.
10. Little detail has been provided concerning the replacement of the existing glass with zinc roofing on the conservatory and what effect this would have on the historic fabric within the southern elevation of the property, if any. Nonetheless, given the conservatory is a modern addition to the property, the replacement of its roofing material is, in principle, acceptable as it is unlikely to have a negative effect on the character and appearance of the listed building. This is also the case in respect to the proposed extension to the more recent or reconstructed lean-to structure on the side of Haselbury Wing.
11. The proposal includes the conversion of the outbuilding to provide additional domestic living space, thereby requiring both internal and external alterations

which, the Heritage Statement³ acknowledges, would lead to the loss of historic fabric, although this has not been quantified. Given the varying states of disrepair within the three sections of the outbuilding I observed during my site visit, the types of works necessary for these spaces to be made habitable would also vary considerably. The degree of uncertainty relating to the level of harm which might result for these works is such that balancing the effect of the proposal against its benefits is problematic, even if details of the proposed insulation, wall and floor finishes could be required by planning condition.

12. Nevertheless, the use of glazing within the proposed doors would introduce an incongruous material in the front elevation of the outbuilding that belies the structure's ancillary function. Whilst an alternative doorway design has been indicated, including a reduction in the amount of glazing used, this is not the scheme before me.
13. I conclude that the proposal would result in harmful alterations and an incongruous link between two designated heritage assets, which would detract from their importance and would not preserve the Grade II listed buildings, or their settings or any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that they possess. Therefore, the proposal conflicts with policies EQ2 and EQ3 of the Local Plan insofar as they require alterations and extensions to existing buildings to preserve or enhance the character of the local area and the significance of its heritage assets. The proposal is also contrary to s66(1) and s16(2) of the Act.
14. The level of harm in this case would be less than substantial. Taking into account that the proposal would lead to the loss of a clear separation between the various structures across the former estate, thereby reducing its status within the village, it is my judgment that the magnitude of this harm would be between the mid to upper end of this scale. This carries considerable importance and weight, consistent with the statutory duty in the Act and reiterated in the Framework. In these circumstances, the Framework states that harm to, or loss of, the special interest/significance of a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification and should be weighed against the public benefits which would be derived from it, including securing its optimum viable use, where appropriate. This will be addressed in the heritage balance below.

Other Matters

15. As the appeal site is located within the Haselbury Plucknett Conservation Area, section 72(1) of the Act is relevant. However, as I have found that the proposal would not preserve the listed buildings, or their settings or any of the features of special architectural or historic interest they possess, it is not necessary for me to consider this matter further as it would not alter the outcome of these appeals.
16. Whilst the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers through a loss of privacy, this is just one part of the requirements set out in Policy EQ2 of the Local Plan.
17. The lack of opposition from the Parish Council, the local community or neighbours does not weigh in favour of the appeal scheme. Although the appellant refers to support of the scheme from the Council's Conservation Officer, no documented evidence of this is before me.

³ Prepared by Kevin Morris Heritage Planning Ltd, dated January 2024

18. The appeal site is located within the catchment zone of the Somerset Levels and Moors Special Protection Area (SPA), a European Designated Site afforded protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2007, as amended. If the circumstances leading to the grant of planning permission had been present, I would have considered the impact of the proposed development on the SPA. However, as I am dismissing the appeal on the main issue above, it is not necessary for me to consider this matter further.

Heritage Balance

19. The proposal would provide additional domestic accommodation for the appellant and his family which, in respect to the outbuilding, secures an alternative use for the structure. Nonetheless, the continued viable residential use of the property as a whole is not dependent upon the scheme before me. Furthermore, little evidence has been provided demonstrating that the proposed alterations to the outbuilding have been designed to support any specific needs.
20. Economic benefits would be derived from the construction and renovation works, albeit at a small scale. Environmental benefits including a reduction in carbon emissions, minimising pollution and enhancing biodiversity are indicated by the appellant to form part of the proposal. However, no substantive evidence of how the proposal would achieve these objectives has been provided.
21. Consequently, whilst some public benefits would be derived from the proposal, the totality of those outlined above do not outweigh the level of harm identified to the special interest of the listed buildings. Clear and convincing justification for this harm has not, therefore, been demonstrated.
22. I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the Grade II listed buildings or their settings or any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that they possess.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other relevant matters raised, I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

Juliet Rogers

INSPECTOR