



Penderfyniadau ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 27/09/2022

gan Melissa Hall BA(Hons), BTP, MSc,
MRTPI

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion
Cymru

Dyddiad: 23/01/2023

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 27/09/2022

by Melissa Hall BA(Hons), BTP, MSc,
MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh
Ministers

Date: 23/01/2023

Appeal A: CAS-01787-D4K5G6

Appeal B: CAS-01788-T3N4W4

Site address: Street House, Llandysilio, Llanymynech SY22 6RB

The Welsh Ministers have transferred the authority to decide these appeals to me as the appointed Inspector.

- **Appeal A** is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - **Appeal B** is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeals are made by Mr & Mrs Oritt against the decisions of Powys County Council.
 - The development and works proposed are described as the '*Removal of single storey modern conservatory and replacement with a single storey glazed extension and associated works of abutments to new extension*'.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

3. A hybrid application form was used for the development and works proposed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. As set out above, two appeals are before me which will be considered on their individual merits. Nevertheless, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two together, except where otherwise indicated.
4. The site address given on the application form refers to 'U4908 from junction of the A483 to the junction of spur'. The Council identified the site as 'Street House, Llandysilio, Llanymynech' in its decision notices. I am satisfied that both refer to the same site and I have used the address given by the Council for the purposes of my decisions.

5. The scheme was amended during the course of the applications, replacing a part pitched, part flat roof extension with a flat roof extension. It is on the basis of the amended scheme that I have considered the appeals.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether the proposed works and development would preserve the listed building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Reasons

7. Street House is a Grade II listed building which dates from the first half of the 19th Century, and which is currently in use as a single dwelling. The listing description describes a three storey, double pile, brick building with dentil eaves, a slate roof and two brick ridge stacks. It has a symmetrical front with windows set towards the corners. The ground and first floor windows are tall double hung sashes and the attic windows are one-and-a-half sashes, all with glazing bars and flat arches. There is a similar window arrangement on the south gable except for a modern bay replacing the ground floor rear sash. It features a central panelled front door (now blocked) with a flat moulded canopy on carved brackets carried over a double width pilaster surround. The rear elevation has a tall, thin, three-storey high stair light with horizontal glazing bars.
8. In addition to the dwelling described in the listing, there is a substantial single storey outbuilding (of brickwork construction save for remnant rubble stone elements) which runs perpendicular to the rear elevation of the house and has discernible sections of brickwork indicating its evolution. An existing infill section annotated as an 'office' links the rear of the dwelling to the first bay of the outbuilding in which the kitchen is located. A large conservatory is sited beyond the southern side elevation of the dwelling and attaches to the outbuilding, the internal access to which is also gained via the office space. The conservatory projects out from the southern elevation in a manner which is alien and at odds with the general form and layout of the two main components described above.
9. The listing description goes on to state that Street House is listed for its group value with the listed buildings running north from Domgay House, which includes the Grade II Listed Domgay House, the Grade II Listed former Domgay Chapel and the Grade II Listed The Golden Lion.
10. The appellants' Heritage Impact Assessment asserts that '*...the building remains one of the key historic buildings in the village and is indicative of a farmer or gentlemen's residence of the early-mid C19*'. From the evidence before me, I consider that its special interest and significance is largely derived from its evidential and aesthetic value as a handsome dwelling of early-mid 19th century date, notwithstanding some unsympathetic alterations and additions over time. The building's age, vernacular, materials, polite aesthetic and a much surviving plan-form all make important contributions in this regard. Although of significant length, the outbuilding reads as subordinate to the main dwelling, not least as it retains a simplicity in its form, language and detailing. In addition, the curtilage, which provides a spatial buffer to the front and side of the building allows the dwelling's form and its principal elevation to be viewed and appreciated from an adjacent public route, despite the erection of a fence of considerable height obscuring a large part of the side garden when seen from this vantage point.
11. Whilst I also accept that the dwelling is no longer on the main thoroughfare through the village given the construction of the A483 Bypass, it nonetheless retains the '*...prominent*

position behind roadside wall referred to in the listing description and contributes to an appreciation of the small group of listed buildings in a wider village settlement context.

12. I do not dispute the appellants' contention that, notwithstanding some strong elements of symmetry, there are other features that are not balanced. Moreover, the modern 20th Century additions, including the conservatory, the missing section of the south-east corner of the outbuilding roof to facilitate the conservatory, the replacement brickwork around the window openings and use of white uPVC guttering on the outbuilding, a concrete gulley drain and other paraphernalia consisting of aerials, a satellite dish and an old alarm box, detract from the significance of the building. Similarly, these elements, some of which can be seen from the gap in the roadside fence with the A483, make little positive contribution to the setting of the building.
13. The proposed works would result in the demolition of the existing conservatory and its replacement with a larger extension of a contemporary design. I do not take issue with the principle of a contemporary addition, which can complement a historic property such as this. I also acknowledge that, overall, the architectural language of the extension would be simple and honest, with some carefully considered detailing such as the use of a frameless roof and eaves window at the juncture with the main dwelling representing minimal intervention.
14. Nevertheless, the increased size of the proposed extension would have the effect of connecting the dwelling and the outbuilding in a manner that the existing conservatory does not. Owing to its greater depth and 'sharp', modern finishes, it would have a robust appearance at odds with the more polite language of the existing dwelling and would compromise the strong linear character of the outbuilding and the understanding of its relationship with the main house. Its overtly contemporary detailing, such as a 'pop out window seat' and an elongated landscape fixed light to the front elevation, would compete with, and draw attention away from, the more ordered detailing of the dwelling's existing elevations and there would be little visual coherence between old and new elements. Whilst the fenestration would be clearly identified as new with its unapologetic and modern frameless glass system, in this case, the most visually prominent units would have a discordant relationship with the existing fenestration. Meanwhile, I am not convinced that the use of scorched larch cladding has been justified in terms of the building's context or that it constitutes an appropriate change in materials in this instance.
15. Although the extension has been designed to match both actual and inferred horizontal lines in the main dwelling and the outbuilding, in many other respects, I find there to be little sympathy in rhythm, materials, detailing or proportions. It is for these reasons that I consider the proposal would represent a dominant and distracting addition, that would detract from the integrity of the dwelling and its associated outbuilding. In all, I conclude that the proposed extension would have a jarring appearance which would harm the special architectural interest of the building. It follows that there would be additional harm to the setting of the listed building, insofar as its greater massing would elevate its presence and give it an importance that would compromise its relationship with the host building and the appreciation of the small group of listed buildings with which it has an association. In the context of the duty to have special regard to the preservation of the listed building and its setting, I am not persuaded that there are not more sensitive ways to incorporate an addition which preserves the essence of this building that contributes so much to its significance.
16. Consequently, the proposal would cause harm to the listed building and its setting, thereby engaging the duty in sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Act to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building and its setting and conflicting with Policy

SP7 of the adopted Powys Local Development Plan and the adopted Historic Environment Supplementary Planning Guidance. It would also be at odds with the advice in Planning Policy Wales, Technical Advice Note 24: The Historic Environment and Section 5.5 of its annexe Managing Change to Listed Buildings in Wales.

17. The case made by the appellants makes much of the unsympathetic nature of the existing conservatory and the benefits of its removal in the event that the proposed scheme was to be granted planning permission and listed building consent. I accept that there are elements of the scheme which represent less harmful interventions and would therefore preserve the listed building. However, in my view, there are other elements of the proposal before me that would be harmful. Hence, even though I have attached weight to the benefits that arise from the removal of the existing conservatory and associated works, it does not justify the harm, albeit of a different nature, that the proposed scheme would have on the listed building and its setting.

Conclusions

18. For the reasons I have given, the proposal would fail to preserve the historic character and special interest of the listed building and its setting. I have taken into account all other material considerations that have been put to me, including the benefits associated with the removal of existing unsympathetic additions and works. However, in view of the special regard to be given to the desirability of preserving the listed building and its setting, these are not considerations that outweigh the harm I have identified. Furthermore, the grant of planning permission would conflict with both national planning policy advice and the development plan. I therefore conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

19. In reaching my decisions, I have taken into account the requirements of sections 3 and 5 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015. I consider that these decisions are in accordance with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards the Welsh Ministers' well-being objective of making our cities, towns and villages even better places in which to live and work.

Melissa Hall

Inspector