



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 13 August 2025

by Samuel Watson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/W1145/W/25/3367380

**Woodsdown, Road from Dunston Cross to Youldonmoor Cross, Pancrasweek
EX22 7JN**

- 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 Ian Cameron against the decision of Torridge District Council.
 - The application Ref is 1/0882/2024/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an extension.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/W1145/Y/25/3367378

**Woodsdown, Road from Dunston Cross to Youldonmoor Cross, Pancrasweek
EX22 7JN**

- 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 Ian Cameron against the decision of Torridge District Council.
 - The application Ref is 1/0883/2024/LBC.
 - The works proposed are erection of an extension.
-

Decision

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed and listed building consent is refused for the erection of an extension.

Applications for costs

3. An application for costs was made by Mr Ian Cameron against Torridge District Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

4. As the appeals concern works affecting a listed building, I have taken account of sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
5. The descriptions in the headers above have been taken from their respective appeal forms as they remove superfluous details included within the application forms. I note that the Council, in their decision notices, used this description too.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:

- Whether the proposed development preserves a grade II listed building¹ and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and,
- The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape

Reasons

Effect on Listed Building

7. The host building was likely built around the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century. It is built of rubble and cob with roughcast render over and is served by a thatched roof. The dwelling sits perpendicular to the road at the end of a short terrace of similar cottages that, collectively, form an L-shape. Prior to this appeal the dwelling was, to all intents and purposes, demolished and, at the time of my site visit, is currently being rebuilt. The gable wall furthest from the road and the return sections projecting from it are the only sections I understand to have been retained of the original building. As a result of this, the interest and significance of the building has been eroded.
8. However, the building is still included on the Statutory List and significance still remains. This significance, in part, arises from the age of the building and its construction using traditional methods and materials, but also from its form and relationship to the surrounding buildings. While it is the retained portions of wall that contribute most particularly to this significance, the rebuilt portion of the building helps towards the understanding of the building's character, use and relationship with the wider area.
9. The proposal would introduce a significant addition that would engulf the host relegating it to visually appear as an extension to the proposal, rather than a dwelling in its own right. The extension would also be visible within the street scene and wider area, dominating the host dwelling and distracting from what should be the most prominent and important features. The extension would also enclose a significant section of the listed building's retained walls so that their legibility as external walls would be lost. The creation of a new opening within the gable wall at first floor level to provide a doorway between the host building and the extension would also result in the further loss of the limited amount of remaining historic fabric. Cumulatively, the proposal would further erode and obfuscate the remaining significance and understanding of the listed building.
10. Against this background, and given the scale of the development, I find that a modest amount of less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset would occur. Although less than substantial, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is clear that great weight should be given to any asset's conservation. Paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
11. The host building is currently in a residential use, and I consider this to be the most viable optimum use for the building. The building is relatively small for modern

¹ Number 4 Woodsdown Cottages (List Entry Number 1317739)

living expectations, but it has not been demonstrated that an extension is required to make occupation viable, nor that a smaller scheme could not achieve the same outcome.

12. Given the works to the listed building are largely finished, the proposal could not now be considered to form enabling works. Moreover, and irrespective of whether the previous permission was granted as enabling works, it is clear that the situation has significantly changed since that permission.
13. The proposal would likely involve the purchasing of materials and the hiring of contractors to complete the works, resulting in some modest and short term benefits to the local economy during the construction phase. The proposal would also result in an improvement to the provided accommodation and, as such to the quality of housing stock within the area. These matters are public benefits but, given the scale of the works, they are modest. Therefore, in the circumstances of this case this public benefit does not outweigh the harm to the designated heritage asset.
14. The proposal would result in harm to the remaining significance and interest of the host building, and no sufficient public benefits have been demonstrated that outweigh this harm. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies DM07, DM25 and ST15 of the North Devon and Torridge Local Plan 2011-2031 (the LP). These require proposals to avoid harm to heritage assets and conserve the built and historic features of national and local importance. They also require an extension's form, scale and design to respect the existing development. The proposal also conflicts with the Framework under section 16, including paragraphs 208, 212 and 215 that similarly seek to protect designated heritage assets.

Character and Appearance of Landscape

15. The appeal site sits at the end of a row of small cottages within an otherwise predominantly rural area surrounded by fields and very sporadic development. The row is bookmarked at one end by the host building and at the other end an outbuilding, both of which sit perpendicular to the row and road. In this way the row as a whole makes an important contribution to the immediate and wider landscape by presenting a traditional and small scale cluster of residential development. Although the nearby hedgerows and trees provide some screening to this group of development, it is a prominent feature in views along the road and would be visible in longer views.
16. By sitting behind the host building and beyond the end of the row, the extension would be an incongruous addition beyond the definitive end point created by the host dwelling. Moreover, the host dwelling would effectively become a forward projection within the row rather than a bookmark feature at the end of it. The proposal would, therefore, affect the traditional form of the row and, by the scale of the extension, its modest nature. The proposal would be visible in close and distant public views as well as be appreciated from the neighbouring properties. As such, and given the above, the extension would harm the contribution the row makes to the surrounding landscape and its historic interest.
17. As a result of the proposal's prominent positioning and relationship with the wider row of dwellings, its size and form would unacceptably affect the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape. The proposal therefore conflicts with LP Policies DM08a, ST04 and DM25 which, in part, seek for proposals to be of a high

quality design with an appropriate scale and massing to respect and respond to the surrounding landscape. The proposal also conflicts with Part 12 of the Framework, including Paragraph 135 which similarly sets out that proposals should add to the overall quality of an area, and be sympathetic to local character, built environment and landscape.

Conclusion

18. The proposal would result in harm to the listed building and the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape in conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above, both appeals A and B should be dismissed.

Samuel Watson

INSPECTOR