



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2022

by **Patrick Hanna MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/Y/21/3283847

The Old Parsonage, Bishop Norton Road, Glentham, Market Rasen LN8 2EU

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Roger Waldock against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref 142364, dated 28 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2021.
 - The works proposed are described as being 'to demolish an old outside toilet building not used for over 50+ years and the attached wood/coal store barn that is in a poor state of repair. We purchased this property 2 years ago and uncovered this from overgrown vegetation we are slowly and sympathetically restoring it for us and future generations. This planning proposal is to clear this area after demolition and rebuild a new garden room and artist studio for our retirement hobbies'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Proposed Arrangements drawing submitted with the appeal is a revised drawing dated July 2021, after the application for listed building consent had been refused by the Council. An appeal should not be the process by which to evolve a scheme, in the interests of fairness to all parties including those who should have been consulted on any changes. Therefore, I have considered the proposal on the basis of what was before the Council at the time of it making its decision.

Main issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed works would preserve the special architectural or historic interest and setting of the Grade II listed building known as The Old Parsonage.

Reasons

4. The Old Parsonage is situated on the west side of Bishop Norton Road in the village of Glentham. The listed building is a two-storey, 5-bay dwelling constructed of limestone and identified within the statutory list description as being a former parsonage of late 18th century origin (List Entry Number: 1064185). The listed building's primary rubble limestone frontage is articulated by modern sliding sashes and faces towards an enclosed garden. The grounds and traditional ancillary structures within the site's boundaries all comprise a part of the listed building's setting.

5. A detached and disused outhouse, comprising a former outside toilet and attached store, is situated towards the site's western boundary and within the setting of the principal listed building. Ostensibly, the outhouse was constructed before 1 July 1948 within the curtilage of the principal Grade II listed building.
6. The appellant attests to the former privy being disused for in excess of fifty years, while the Council's conservation officer considers it to be a rare survival of an 18th century outhouse. Paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets that may be affected by a proposal including any contribution made by their setting. From my own observations and without evidence from the appellant to the contrary, I take the outhouse to have formed part of the land before 1 July 1948, therefore within the curtilage of the Grade II listed Old Parsonage and covered by the same statutory protection.
7. The listed building continues to reflect the traditional local vernacular, implicit in the identification of its group value (G.V.II) within the statutory list description. Notwithstanding its state of disrepair, the rudimentary form of the outhouse structure denotes a historic functional association with the principal dwelling and reflects a hierarchy of use and function within the listed building's grounds and setting.
8. From the evidence available to me, and from my own observations, I consider the significance and special interest of the Old Parsonage is drawn in part from its historic use as a parsonage as well as from its surviving historic fabric, form and layout. The grounds and traditional ancillary structures within its setting also contribute to the listed building's significance and special interest.
9. The proposal is to demolish the former privy and replace it with a 1.5 storey garden studio constructed of rubble limestone with brick detailing and timber windows. Wholesale demolition of the outhouse would inevitably result in a loss of historic fabric as well as undermine legibility of the way the historic hierarchy and function is understood.
10. Whilst the replacement garden studio would be constructed of sympathetic and quality materials, in relation to the extant structure the footprint of the replacement building would be much larger. The scale and massing of the proposed structure would be a competing and intrusive feature alongside the principal elevation of the Old Parsonage as seen from the garden. The proposed arched door and window design fails to relate to the simpler window proportions of the Old Parsonage. On that basis, the proposal would undermine the differentiation in scale and hierarchy that currently reveals the Old Parsonage as the primary structure and the outhouse as having a secondary, subordinate relationship to it.
11. Whether or not noticeable from public vantages, and notwithstanding that a considerable area of garden would remain, the proposal would be a dominating domestic intrusion within the setting of the Old Parsonage. In combination with the inherent loss of traditional fabric, the proposals would, in my judgement, detract from the integrity and special interest of the listed building, which would not be preserved.
12. The degree of harm to the Old Parsonage as a designated heritage asset would be less than substantial, which should be weighed against the public benefits of

the proposal, including securing the optimum viable use of the listed building. No evidence has been advanced that would indicate that the proposal would secure the optimum viable use of the listed building as a single dwelling, nor has it been demonstrated that the proposal is the least harmful option. Other than some very short-term economic benefits associated with the demolition and construction phases, the convenience afforded by the additional garden space it would provide would be of personal advantage to the appellants. Satisfying the personal circumstances and wishes of the appellants does not amount to a wider public benefit. Overall, there would not be public benefits sufficient to outweigh the material harm to the designated heritage asset, which must be given considerable importance and weight.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposed works would fail to preserve the listed building, its setting or its features of special architectural interest, contrary to the clear expectations in Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Even though the overall harm would be less than substantial in this case, this overarching statutory duty must be given considerable importance and weight. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Patrick Hanna
INSPECTOR