



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 23 September 2025

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/D1265/W/25/3369820

Manor Farm, Church Lane, Stour Provost, Dorset SP8 5SA

- 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 Jeremy Hemans of Yeoman Property Development Ltd against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref is P/HOU/2025/02818.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extension of detached annex building.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/D1265/Y/25/3369697

Manor Farm, Church Lane, Stour Provost, Dorset SP8 5SA

- 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 Jeremy Hemans of Yeoman Property Development Ltd against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref is P/LBC/2025/02378.
 - The development proposed is insertion of dormer window, formation of shower room in attic space and replacement kitchen window.
-

Appeal C Ref: APP/D1265/Y/25/3369816

Manor Farm, Church Lane, Stour Provost, Dorset SP8 5SA

- 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 Jeremy Hemans of Yeoman Property Development Ltd against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref is P/LBC/2025/02819.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extension of detached annex building.
-

Decisions

1. Appeals A, B and C are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the descriptions of development and works from the application forms as confirmation that changes were agreed has not been provided.
3. As the proposals are in a conservation area and relate 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).

Main Issues

4. The main issues are whether the proposal would:

- Preserve the Grade II listed building known as “Manor Farmhouse” (Ref: 1172617) and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses;
- Preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Stour Provost Conservation Area (the CA); and
- Preserve the setting, as it relates to the special interest of the nearby listed buildings known as the “Church of St Michael” (the church) (Ref: 1110379) and the “Table-Tomb Approximately 3m South Of Tower Of St Michael's Church” (the tomb) (Ref: 1324531).

Reasons

Manor Farmhouse and outbuildings

5. Manor Farmhouse is a property of likely 15th century origin remodelled in later centuries following the changing vernacular. It has rubble walls with gable slate roof with end brick stacks and ashlar quoins. There are sash windows with vertical glazing bars and internally braced collar beam of the medieval roof. It may have originated as a first-floor hall with adjoining solar. Externally the front elevation has a pleasing simplicity in the architectural form, materials and openings. Although there is some variation in the finer detail of the windows of which some appear more modern.
6. The outbuildings around Manor Farmhouse demonstrate the importance of the main building they once served and the agricultural activities that they supported. The outbuildings are of varying scale and materials with some being more modern. Nevertheless, and despite some no longer being used for agriculture, their form, relative layout and appearance still reflect the historic narrative of Manor Farmhouse. The high status of Manor Farmhouse comes partly from these curtilage buildings which contribute to its special interest.
7. The special interest of Manor Farmhouse derives, so far as relevant to this appeal, from its architectural interest in terms of detailing, methods of construction and historic interest as a well-preserved example of a high status, vernacular manor house.

Appeals A and C

8. The fenestration of the outbuilding is generally more residential than agricultural in appearance and internally evidence of any historic use is minimal. Areas have already been subdivided. Notwithstanding this, the simple form of the building and its roof, as well as its relative position to the Manor Farmhouse, means it retains its historic legibility as a functional agricultural building. While other outbuildings appear to have been added to, these additions are generally single storey, often lean to style extensions, as is the case on the building subject to these appeals. This retains the overall linear appearance and does not disrupt the simple roof shape. They are still read as part of the historic layout as a result. Rooms in the roof space are accommodated within the historic roof shape.
9. The proposed external covered area would be a lean-to style set below the main roof in a similar way to the existing ones either side of the outbuilding and therefore assimilate into the existing and historic overall shape. In contrast, the 2-storey gable roof extension, would significantly disrupt one side of the roof

elevation and become an over dominant feature given its size and position. This would be visually jarring and erode the simple, vernacular form of the building. Being 2 storey in height and protruding centrally to one of the main elevations, its position would be untypical for this building and the range of buildings.

10. The proposal would overwhelm the utilitarian appearance of the outbuilding that currently contributes to the special interest of Manor Farmhouse. The extension would be of a more complex design than this or the other outbuildings. The extension would be on the opposite elevation to Manor Farmhouse and the internal yard. Nevertheless, the buildings, and the discordant extension would still be experienced together.
11. Internally there are exposed timbers in the area where the first-floor bathroom would join the existing building. It is said that the purlin could be retained with a step down. Nonetheless, from the information before me, it has not been shown that this and other potentially hidden roof elements, could be accommodated without loss or damage to the historic fabric of the building.
12. A previously approved extension at the building was for a more lightweight lean-to extension. This did not have the same extent of works to the roof, retaining its overall profile and shape. While there may have been discussions over a different design with hayloft style opening, this is not on the plans before me. Map and appellant evidence indicate the building used to be adjoined to the house and other outbuildings and it may not have been built as one unit. Nevertheless, there is no compelling evidence that the historic arrangement was of 2-storey form, comparable position or design to that proposed. Consequently, these other schemes and previous arrangements are materially different to this one.
13. Some of the changes relate to the internal parts of the building or those not overly visible in public vantage points. Despite this, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether or not public views of the building can be gained.
14. Given the above, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of Manor Farmhouse. Due to the number and nature of concerns, the proposal would cause harm at the lower end of less than substantial harm but nevertheless is of considerable importance and
15. There would be small public benefits from energy and thermal efficiency given the scale of the scheme. The ground floor stone would match the existing building and timber cladding, which would weather over time, is found in part at other outbuildings so would not be an alien material. However, this is a neutral factor. Improvements to the facilities and accommodation for occupiers is a private benefit. The building is already an annexe and the continued viable use of the appeal building as this is not dependent on the proposal. It has not been shown that this purpose would cease in the absence of the scheme.
16. As a result, the public benefits are not sufficient to outweigh the harm to the designated heritage asset. The proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the listed building. It would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 210 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and insofar as relevant, the heritage and design protection aims of Policy 5 of the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1.

Appeal B

17. While previously removed and subsequently re-instated, the intricate roof frame is an impressive feature and links back to the historic layout, construction and form of the building. There are views of the craftsmanship and grand appearance of the roof from the double height area. Although the ceilings, the glass screen and flooring are modern, these are not distracting. While there have been different partitions in place to this section of the building, at present it is largely open and there are views that allow an appreciation of the roof and feeling of space. The internal roof structure is a key feature that draws your attention where it can be seen and reflects the evidential and architectural value of the building.
18. The proposal would further divide the open internal roof area. The creation of an enclosed shower room and introduction of the necessary features would create a more cluttered area further eroding the open spatial quality of the area. There are currently views to and from the open attic area of the braced collar beams and trusses. The closing off of part of the internal roof space would reduce the ability to appreciate these important aspects of the building and its historic layout by having a solid enclosure rather than the glazed rail. The legibility of the roof structure would be diminished.
19. There would still be views of the timbers from the stairs up to the room and within it. The partition would sit away from the main roof frame and be a backdrop to it. However, even if the new walls were lathe and plaster, this would not prevent the harm from the subdivision.
20. There are already some services in this area and in nearby rooms. Nevertheless, it is unclear how and where the additional ones would be accommodated without works to the historic fabric of the building or how fittings would relate to the historic features of it. Given the importance of these details for considering the special interest of the building, it would not be appropriate to impose a condition requiring such details being agreed after any permission/consent being granted.
21. The proposed dormer would be located between the historic structure and would be a small, sympathetic addition given its simple design and choice of materials. While the proposed kitchen window would be double glazed, there is no consistency to the fenestration on the front elevation. There is variation in the glazing, design and bulkiness of the bars and frames as well as differences in cills and lintels. The existing kitchen window is itself modern and the proposed replacement would replicate the style of the existing one. It would therefore not disrupt the pattern of openings or cause the loss of historic fabric. As a result, the dormer and replacement window would have a neutral effect on the special interest of the building.
22. As above, while the proposed works may not be prominent from public vantage points and partly relate to internal works, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether or not public views of the building can be gained.
23. Given the above, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building. Due to the importance of the roof structure, it would lead to a moderate level of less than substantial harm.

24. There would be small public benefits from energy and thermal efficiency given the scale of the scheme. Improvements to the facilities and accommodation for occupiers is a private benefit. The continued viable use of the appeal property as a residential dwelling is not dependent on the proposal and there is no compelling case that this use would cease were the appeal dismissed.
25. As a result, the public benefits are not sufficient to outweigh the harm to the designated heritage asset. The proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the listed building. It would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 210 of the Framework and insofar as relevant, the heritage and design aims of Policy 5 of the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1.

Conservation Area – all appeals

26. The CA covers the historic core of the settlement which is primarily made up of vernacular cottages and other residential properties located off rural lanes. There is a general consistency to the scale, materials and form of much of the buildings. The church and Manor Farmhouse are some of the more prominent buildings in the CA.
27. The significance of the CA comes in part, from the relative uniformity in design and materials of the cluster of buildings in an informal arrangement around the church with mainly open fields beyond. Manor Farm and the outbuilding subject to these appeals contribute positively to the CA in regard to the historic layout of the area and use of traditional materials.
28. The appeal buildings are set back from the road and largely screened in public views. Moreover, the scope of the external alterations would be limited in comparison to the overall scale of built form at the site and the wider CA. Due to the extent of the changes, limited visibility from the public and private domains and the effect on the CA as a whole, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA.
29. Thus, the proposals would preserve the character and appearance of the CA and satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 210 of the Framework and would be consistent with Policy 5 of the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1.

Nearby Listed Buildings – all appeals

30. The Church dates from the 13th century with later alterations. It is constructed from coursed rubble and ashlar with stone slate roofs in places. It has a square bell tower of moderate stature and is set within an extensive churchyard. The main processional approach is from a lychgate, situated on Church Lane. The setting of the church is primarily associated with its churchyard where the memorialisation of past lives and opportunities for quiet contemplation contribute directly to its special interest. The wider rural context of the building also speaks to its role as a country church which would have once served an agricultural community.
31. The tomb is located close to the front of the church alongside the processional approach. It is a flat top moulded stone feature with sunken relief inscription. Its special interest comes, in part from its historical associations being a permanent testament to those which the inscriptions relate and the focus of grief and memorial for them. Its location within the churchyard contributes to its special interest through the historic context this provides in relation to the other

monuments and graves. As such, its setting insofar as it contributes to its significance is associated with the churchyard rather than any wider context in which it is experienced.

32. Manor Farmhouse and the outbuilding subject to this appeal would continue to form part of the built form in the wider area. Given the scale and nature of the proposal, the verdant and rural feel to the village would be retained.
33. Bearing in mind the separation distances and the limited extent of the external works, the proposal would not harm the setting, as it relates to the significance, of these assets. As such, it would satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 210 of the Framework and would not be contrary to Policy 5 of the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1.

Conclusion

34. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
35. For the reasons given above the appeals should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR