



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 July 2026

by Simon Hand MA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 August 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/F/25/3363959

12 The Dower House Parnell Road, Stoke Gifford, BS16 1ZS

- The appeal is made under section 39 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended (the Act).
 - The appeal is made by Linkboat Ltd against a listed building enforcement notice issued by South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The enforcement notice, numbered COM/24/0551/LB/1, was issued on 11 March 2025.
 - The contravention of listed building control alleged in the notice is erection of an internal partition wall without listed building consent (marked partition wall in enclosed photograph at Appendix 1 and approximate position shown in Appendix 2 in red).
 - The requirements of the notices are to: Remove the internal partition wall in its entirety (for the avoidance of doubt, this is marked partition wall on enclosed photograph at Appendix 1 and approximate position shown in Appendix 2 in red). Make good any damage to the cornice and decorative plaster finish once the partition is removed using matching materials.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 1 month.
 - The appeal is made on the grounds set out in section 39(1)(c), (e), (h) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.
-

Decision

1. It is directed that the listed building enforcement notice be corrected by the deletion of the words "1 month" and their substitution with the words "6 months" in the Time for Compliance. Subject to this correction the appeal is dismissed and the listed building enforcement notice is upheld. Listed building consent is refused for the retention of the works carried out in contravention of section 9 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant notes that the red line on the enforcement notice plan is in the wrong place. As far as I could tell, it was more or less in the right place but was not drawn accurately. It shows a minor kink in an otherwise straight line whereas it is more like a dogleg. However, there is only one dividing wall in the room on the plan, which is accompanied by a photograph showing part of the newly created room and part of the wall, so I think there can be no doubt as to which wall is in question and no amendment to the plan is necessary.

The Appeal on Grounds (c) and (e)

3. The Dower House is a large grade II* listed building that has been subdivided into flats. It has a simple 'H' plan with the ends of the 'H' forming large front and rear canted bays. As the Council point out the conversion was undertaken with a careful emphasis on retaining as much as the original floor plan and form of the building as possible. Its previous history as a hospital and then a part of the University of the West of England meant its internal layout had already been

severely compromised but the large, canted bay rooms had survived¹. Each flat on the second floor has a single large room in the bay, labelled dining/living.

4. The appellant has subdivided the large room in flat 12 to create 2 smaller rooms with a partition down the middle, splitting the room in half. The appellant describes the harm as 'hypothetical' and the works as minor. In fact the harm is real and obvious. Given the demands of a hospital, university and residential uses it is somewhat of a miracle these spaces survived from the original building. Their retention in the conversion to flats was an important consideration as one of the few elements of the original domestic Georgian architecture to remain. The retention of these spaces is important in retaining the special architectural or historic interest of the character of the building. While its loss falls within the less than substantial harm element of the NPPF there are no countervailing public benefits to offset. I do not agree that the flats are so disproportionate they cannot be used for modern day living.
5. The appellant argues that other flats have encroached into the bays, but the example of flat 9 merely shows the bay is not quite as deep as at No12, but it still retains the sense of being a large end room which is a key characteristic. The appeals on both grounds fail.

The Appeal on Ground (h)

6. The Council have given 1 month to remove the wall and make good. I agree that a longer period is required, not least because arrangements will have to be made with the current tenants (although the actual works should not take more than a couple of days), and the need to find suitable workmen to carry out the work. I consider that 6 months should be ample time to enable this and shall amend the notice accordingly.

Conclusion

7. The appeal is refused as the works do not preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the character of the building, but I shall extend the time for compliance to 6 months.

Simon Hand

INSPECTOR

¹ At least on the second floor – the only floor I have plans for