
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by Juliet Rogers BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P1133/Y/25/3369574

Chants Cottage, Road Past Welwyn Farm to Heath Cross, Heath Cross, Whitestone, Devon EX4 2HN

- 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 Leon Palmer-Christie against the decision of Teignbridge District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00638/LBC.
 - The works proposed comprise a two-storey side extension with single storey glass link.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As this appeal relates to a listed building consent, I have had special regard to sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
3. There is no accompanying appeal relating to the associated planning application for the above development and the installation of solar panels¹. Therefore, my considerations relate solely to the works that are the subject of the listed building consent application, notwithstanding any requirement for planning permission.
4. The Council are in the process of preparing the Teignbridge Local Plan 2020-2040 (the Emerging Plan) which has been submitted for public examination. However, as the Emerging Plan is yet to be adopted I give the policies therein minor weight in my decision and have taken account of the policies within the extant Teignbridge Local Plan 2013-2033 (the Local Plan) insofar as they are relevant to the proposal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building known as Chants Cottage² or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Reasons

6. Chants Cottage (the Cottage) is a small dwelling constructed from whitewashed rendered cob with a thatched hipped roof. It is an attractive example of the local vernacular of a small farmworker's cottage constructed as a single-cell property in the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century. Another room, serving as a

¹ Council ref: 25/00637/FUL

² List Entry No: 1216263, date first listed 4 September 1986

kitchen, was added later, with exterior walls of a similar thickness of the earliest room. Although various additions and alterations have been made to the dwelling, internally and externally, historic vernacular features remain, including the cruck frame roof and the eyebrowed eaves above the first-floor windows on the southern elevation.

7. As evidenced by the aerial photograph included within a document submitted as part of a pre-application enquiry³, several barn and stable structures were located on the site. Many of these have now been removed, including the two single storey structures shown on the photograph sited closest to the Cottage. As a result, the dwelling is set within a spacious garden area, overlooking rolling landscape to the south. Therefore, the special interest of the Cottage, insofar as is relevant to the appeal scheme, relates to its age, use of traditional construction methods and local materials, and the appreciable evolution and enlargement of the dwelling over time.
8. The proposal comprises a two-storey structure with a short, glazed link at ground floor level providing covered access to the Cottage. Even if intended to be appear as a single storey structure, the use of large windows at ground and first floor level in its western gable end signifies its two-storey composition, accentuating the height of the extension, despite lower ridge and eaves heights than the Cottage. This scale would be reinforced by the rooflight within the northerly slope of the roof. Although the appellant indicates an agreement to omit this feature, it remains on the Proposed Plan and Elevations⁴. Furthermore, no other opening or source of lighting to the bathroom has been confirmed.
9. Despite the use of contemporary features and materials which would clearly differentiate the age of extension from the existing dwelling, it would be sited close to the Cottage's western elevation. In combination with its bulk and fenestration arrangement, the proposal would not demonstrate subservience to the Cottage, detracting from its picturesque character and its setting. The fact that it would not be fully visible from the Cottage's driveway, does not alter the impact the extension would have on the significance of this heritage asset.
10. Whilst not decisive in my decision, I also have concerns regarding the effect of the glazed link on the historic fabric of the western elevation of the Cottage given the proposal includes the installation of a new doorway. As minimal details of these works have been provided, the full effect of this part of the proposal is unknown.
11. I conclude that the proposal would not preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed building known as Chants Cottage, or its setting, thus failing to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment. The level of harm in this case would be less than substantial. Taking into account the close siting of the main part of the extension to the listed building and its resultant dominance, the magnitude of harm in this case would be close to a moderate level of the less than substantial scale. In these circumstances the Framework states that harm to or loss of the 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.

³ Council ref: 25/00009/PE

⁴ Dwg no 1748 CCW PA01 rev C

12. The proposal would provide additional high quality and enhanced living space to support modern family living. However, this would mostly be a private benefit. Some economic benefits would be derived from the construction works, albeit at a small scale. Although solar panels are proposed within the Cottage's garden, as these form part of the planning application they do not weigh in favour of the proposal. No other environmental benefits have been indicated.
13. 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 building or the contribution its setting makes to the significance of this heritage asset. Additionally, I have no substantive reason to conclude that the continued residential use of the Cottage is dependent upon the appeal scheme. As such, clear and convincing justification for the less than substantial harm I have identified above has not been demonstrated.
14. Reference is made to planning permission and listed building consent⁵ previously granted by the Council, but these details are not before me nor are they referenced within the Officer Report. Likewise, whilst similar additions may be found on comparable listed buildings, no specific works or consents have been provided. Consequently, such examples do not weigh in favour of the proposal.
15. I conclude that the proposal would not preserve the Grade II listed building known as Chants Cottage, or its setting, or any of the features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses. Insofar as they relate to the significance, character, setting and local distinctiveness of a heritage asset, the proposal conflicts with Policy EN5 of the Local Plan and Policy EN17 of the Emerging Plan.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above and having regard to all relevant matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Juliet Rogers

INSPECTOR

⁵ Council refs: 19/00792/FUL and 19/00793/LBC