



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 19 August 2025

by **B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th September 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/W1850/W/25/3358800

The Homestead, Fromes Hill, Ledbury HR8 1HR

- 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 F Southall against the decision of Herefordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 242009.
 - The development proposed is a side two storey extension and first floor extension to form master bedroom.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/W1850/Y/25/3358801

The Homestead, Fromes Hill, Ledbury HR8 1HR

- 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 F Southall against the decision of Herefordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 242010.
 - The works proposed is a side two storey extension and first floor extension to form master bedroom.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeal site consists of the Grade II listed building known as 'The Homestead'. In reaching my decisions, I have considered the statutory duties under sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 (the Act).
4. The appeals concern the same site and the same scheme. Although the remit of planning permission (Appeal A) and listed building consent (Appeal B) regimes are different, to reduce repetition, I have dealt with both appeals together in a single decision letter.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in both appeals is whether the proposal would preserve the listed building, or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

6. The appeal property consists of a Grade II listed 17th century cottage, known as the Homestead, located off a single track lane to the north of the settlement of Fromes Hill. The property was listed¹ in 1973, and at the time of listing, was a 1 storey, with attic, timber box framed detached dwelling, with a tiled roof, painted brick nogging and end stone stack, two gabled dormers and a gabled porch.
7. Whilst the oldest part of the house is late 17th century, it has been extensively extended in the 1970's. These additions comprise of three front pitched roofed dormers, a similar rear dormer, a front projection and a substantial two storey side/rear extension which adds a further large flat roofed rear dormer. The timber gabled porch and the casement windows are also modern additions.
8. The additions and extensions are largely not sensitive to the building's historic aesthetics, and the character and form of the listed building has therefore been compromised. Nevertheless, the extension is clearly visually distinct from the historic core of the asset and, given its limited width at first floor, subservient when viewed from the front, the narrow, linear nature of the building's historic core remains legible.
9. Internally, the dwelling is also much changed, nevertheless, the historic plan-form remains legible and the phases of the property and its extension, clear. Historic features of architectural interest remain such as the timber-frame and beams visible on both floors, with the timber-frame exposed at the south end of the first floor with some of the historic roof structure visible.
10. Based on the evidence before me, I find that the special interest of the listed building to be primarily associated with its historic and architectural interests. Important contributors in these regards which are pertinent to the appeals, are its illustration and use of traditional methods of construction and materials; legibility of its surviving historic core and plan-form; extant historic fabric; and key historic features and detailing.
11. A two storey side extension is proposed, in order to accommodate an open plan kitchen-diner to the ground floor, and the installation of an additional double staircase, which would provide further access to the first floor and new master bedroom, en-suite and office space. These works are restricted to the extended part of the dwelling, as are the insulation and placement timber flooring set out in the design and access statement. As such, no historic fabric would be lost in this respect.
12. However, the additional extension would increase the scale of the modern element of the property to the extent that the majority of the floorspace of the property would be contained within the extension.
13. The scale and proportions of the two storey addition would have a poor relationship with the historic building and would visually overwhelm it. This would be particularly evident when viewed from the front, given the additional massing at first floor level and its projection in line with the existing frontage would emphasise the increased width of the building.

¹ listing reference 1082395

14. The double gable design of the roof of the extension, when viewed from the rear, in addition to the irregular pattern of fenestration, would also result in an awkward convoluted appearance. It would not be sensitive to the simple architectural form of the historic building and would emphasize the L shaped layout.
15. The resultant extension would, by virtue of its design and scale, no longer be subservient and would have an increased prominence. Along with the new staircase that minimises the importance of the existing staircase within the core of the historic property, this would disrupt the hierarchy of the primary historic core and secondary extension. The historic narrow, linear nature of the listed building would be harmfully obscured. Two additional side elevation dormers would also be added, in addition to another front dormer, bringing the total to 8. Given that the existing dormers were not part of the historic design of the building, this also obscures its historic architectural interests and form.
16. The submitted Heritage Impact Statement² sets out that tithe maps and OS surveys indicate that the building was originally five dwellings, likely to have been a group of agricultural workers cottages. It is stated that the existing house roughly corresponds to the middle two cottages of the original line with the north end of the existing building being a modern extension on the site of the former northern two cottages.
17. Whilst this may be the case, as set out above, the extension would add a modern element that is comfortably larger than the historic remaining building. The resultant dwelling would appear as a large modernised L shaped detached property rather than a terrace of agricultural workers cottages. The proportions of the resultant dwelling would make the vernacular architectural style and its legibility of its surviving historic core and plan-form difficult to appreciate.
16. I conclude that the proposed works and development would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building, The Homestead, and would harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
17. Given the existing extension to the property, I find the harm to the heritage asset to be a minor level of 'less than substantial'.
18. There are aspects of the scheme that would be of public benefit. Heritage benefits would accrue from the replacement of the unsympathetic and sizable rear flat roofed dormer with a smaller pitched roof dormer. This would, by virtue of its reduced scale and a design that is more in keeping with the other dormers, sustain and enhance the listed building.
19. 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.
20. Given the scale of the works and development, any benefits from improved thermal performance, ventilation and general improved accommodation are each likely to be small. There is no substantive evidence before me that the continued viable use of the property is reliant on the proposal. This carries little weight in favour of the proposals, therefore.

² by Holland Heritage Dec 2024

21. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) indicates that, when considering the impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. On balance, in giving considerable importance and weight to the harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset, I find that this would not be outweighed by the public benefits that the proposal would generate.
22. Consequently, the harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset in these appeals has not been supported by clear and convincing justification. The proposal would not preserve the Grade II listed building The Homestead. The works and development therefore would conflict with the statutory presumptions set out in sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Act and fail to satisfy the historic environment conservation and enhancement policies of the Framework. There is also conflict with Policies LD1, LD4, SD1 and SS6 of the Herefordshire Local Plan - Core Strategy 2011-2031 (2015) insofar as these collectively require development to protect, conserve and where possible enhance heritage assets and important features.

Other matters

23. The appellant contends that the existing building is now marginal in terms of assessment against the criteria for listing. It is not for me as part of these appeals to consider and/or make a judgement on the relative merits of the building's listed status. I have considered the appeals on the basis that it is a designated heritage asset and assessed the proposal against the current legislative and policy context.

Conclusion – both appeals

23. For the reasons given above, I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR