The Planning Inspectorate

3/C Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 0303 444 5300
Customer Services:
0303 444 5000

Email: west2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate

Planning Officer
Wiltshire Council
County Hall Bythesea Road
TROWBRIDGE
BA14 8JN

Your Ref: PL/2024/00196
Our Ref: APP/Y3940/D/24/3343283

04 September 2024

Dear Planning Officer,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Appeal by Mr D Threlfall
Site Address: 14 Calcutt Street, Cricklade, SWINDON, SN6 6BD

I enclose a copy of our Inspector's decision on the above appeal(s).

If you have queries or feedback about the decision or the way we handled the appeal(s), you should submit them using our "Feedback" webpage at https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/planning-inspectorate/about/complaints-procedure.

If you do not have internet access please write to the Customer Quality Unit at the address above.

If you would prefer hard copies of our information on the right to challenge and our feedback procedure, please contact our Customer Service Team on 0303 444 5000.

Please note the Planning Inspectorate is not the administering body for High Court challenges. If you would like more information on the strictly enforced deadlines for challenging, or a copy of the forms for lodging a challenge, please contact the Administrative Court on 020 7947 6655.

The Planning Inspectorate cannot change or revoke the outcome in the attached decision. If you want to alter the outcome you should consider obtaining legal advice as only the High Court can quash this decision.

We are continually seeking ways to improve the quality of service we provide to our customers. As part of this commitment we are seeking feedback from those who use our service. It would be appreciated if you could take some time to complete this short survey, which should take no more than a few minutes complete:

https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/Planning_inspectorate_customer_survey

Thank you in advance for taking the time to provide us with valuable feedback.

Yours sincerely,

Nadia Hussain
Nadia Hussain

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-inspectorate-privacy-notices

Where applicable, you can use the internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of cases through GOV.UK. The address of the search page is - https://www.gov.uk/appeal-planning-inspectorate

The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2024

by Laura Cuthbert BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/D/24/3343283
Bryn Cottage, 14 Calcutt Street, Cricklade, Swindon SN6 6BD

- 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 D Threlfall against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
- The application Ref is PL/2024/00196.
- The development proposed is Detached double garage and store outbuilding, with ancillary floorspace above.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, having particular regard to the effect on the significance of the Cricklade Conservation Area and Bryn Cottage, a Grade II Listed Building, as designated heritage assets, through development in it and within its setting, and the non-designated heritage asset known as the Cricklade Museum, through development within its setting.

Reasons

3. Bryn Cottage is located on the northern side of Calcutt Street and is an early 19th century two storey house with attic, built in rendered red brick and stone slate roof. It is a Grade II Listed Building. It has a 2-bay frontage with the front door to the left hand side, a 6-panel door in a doorcase with fluted pilasters and 16 pane sashes with slightly cambered heads. The rear has a linear gable extension and recent kitchen extension to the garden. Consequently, its significance for the purposes of this appeal lies primarily from its age, historic built form, materials and architectural details.

4. It is acknowledged that Bryn Cottage has not been listed specifically for its 'setting or associated plot', as noted by the appellant. However, due to the appeal site's proximity and clear relationship with the designated heritage asset, by virtue of it being within its recognised private garden area, the site of the proposal forms part of the setting in which the heritage asset is experienced, and thus contributes towards its significance, aiding understanding as its role as an early domestic dwelling.

5. The appeal site is also within the Cricklade Conservation Area (CA), which was designated in May 1970. The Cricklade Conservation Area Statement (CA Statement) (adopted 1999) identifies Calcutt Street, Character Area 3.7, as an important access route into the town, with a mix of two storey older cottages and modern dwellings characteristic of the area. It states that the north side of Calcutt Street, where Bryn Cottage lies, consists mainly of terraces of small houses. I saw that although houses are a mixture of old and new, the character has a consistency which fails in only a few locations. I acknowledge that the presence of 'some pitched roof dormers' is also noted.

6. The appellant has noticed that whilst Bryn Cottage itself falls within Character Area 3.7, the site of the proposed outbuilding, to the rear of Bryn Cottage, falls within Character Area 3.6, 'Horse Fair Lane and Thames Lane', where the CA statement identifies that 'the buildings are generally undistinguished'. However, it recommends that any new development in the area should be carefully controlled to reflect the most pertinent aspects of the character of the area, with regard to using traditional materials, scale, proportion and details.

7. Overall, the significance of the CA derives from the statutorily protected buildings, townscape features, valuable open space and water, and significant foliage. Taking the above into account, I consider that the character and architectural built form of Bryn Cottage, including its setting, by virtue of it being a statutorily protected building, contributes positively towards the significance of the CA, reinforcing some of the characteristics identified above that contribute towards the significance of the CA.

8. Immediately to the south of the appeal site is the 19th Century Cricklade Museum, formally the Rehoboth Chapel. The Cricklade CA Statement advises that it was built in 1852 for the Particular Baptists, a strict sect who used the Hatchetts ford for adult baptism. The building provides evidence of the cultural and social links associated with the former chapel use on site, including its contribution to the wider community. Consequently, I consider it to be a non-designated heritage asset of moderate significance, and the appeal site, due to its proximity, forms part of its setting to the rear allowing an appreciation of the building.

9. There is an existing dilapidated garage on the appeal site that the proposal would replace and whilst it is not particularly attractive, its small scale allows it to sit discreetly within its historic context. Consequently, the existing garage currently has a neutral impact, rather than a 'negative' impact as alleged by the appellant, on the significance of the CA and the significance of both the listed building and non-designated heritage asset, as a result of it being built form within their setting.

10. The proposal, by virtue of its form, scale, massing and design would result in a substantially sized outbuilding, which would be a dominant and incongruous addition to the historic site. The introduction of large areas of glazing to both the front and garden elevations of the proposal would contrast uncomfortably alongside the traditional listed building, representing an unharmonious addition to the appeal site. Whilst the materials, notably the use of cedar cladding, would not in itself be unacceptable, on the scale and massing that is proposed, it would emphasise the incongruity of the proposal.

11. The face of the dormer that would be incorporated on the front of the outbuilding would sit flush with the ground floor elevation below and would only sit marginally below the roof ridge. These design features, alongside its excessive width and non-traditional fenestration, would result in a dormer that would visually dominate the front elevation of the proposal, which would not be complimentary to the local context. There are dormer windows in the immediate area, including that on Bryn Cottage itself. However, these are smaller in scale, with more traditional fenestration details than the proposal.

12. I observed that a more modern Orangery has been added to the rear of Bryn Cottage and that the proposal would be seen sited at its nearest point to this structure. However, the proposed building would still be seen in the context of the listed building, forms part of the surroundings in which the listed building is experienced and thus would be within its setting. Furthermore, whilst public views of the proposal would be limited, such visibility is not a prerequisite for harm to occur and does not make up for the unsuitable nature of the proposed development.

13. The harm that I have found would be caused to the significance of the listed building and the CA, would be localised. Accordingly, the harm would be less than substantial. Nevertheless, I afford considerable importance and weight to that harm. The National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (the Framework) also requires that great weight should be given to heritage assets' conservation. As required by paragraph 208 of the Framework, this harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposed development.

14. I recognise that the proposal would provide a secure parking and storage area for Bryn Cottage, a suitable home office space for the appellant, as well as potential overnight accommodation for visiting family. It would also replace the existing concrete garage which could be seen as a benefit. In addition, there would be some economic benefits associated with the purchase of materials and the construction of the building. Taking all the above into consideration, I am of the view that taken together, the public benefits would not outweigh the harm I have found to the heritage assets.

15. The proposal would also result in harm to the significance of a non-designated heritage asset of moderate significance, through development within its setting. The harm to the significance of a building of moderate significance would result in a minor level of harm. Paragraph 209 of the Framework, in respect of non-designated heritage assets, requires decision makers to make a 'balanced judgement' having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the asset. I find that the limited benefits of the scheme outlined above would again not outweigh the harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.

16. The appellant has drawn my attention to another planning permission[1] for a detached outbuilding granted by the Council in relation to The Old Pottery to the north of the site. I have been provided with the relevant plans and decision notice. However, the circumstances in each proposal are likely to be different. Notably, whilst the other approval was similarly within the Cricklade CA, the proposal before me now is also within the setting of a Grade II Listed

[1] Application Ref 15/01095/FUL

Building and a non-designated heritage asset. I have determined this appeal on its own merits and have found harm for the reasons set out above.

17. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, having particular regard to the effect on the significance of the Cricklade CA and Bryn Cottage, a Grade II Listed Building, as designated heritage assets, through development in it and within its setting, and the non-designated heritage asset known as the Cricklade Museum, through development within its setting. It would conflict with Core Policies 57 and 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (January 2015). These policies, in combination, require a high standard of design to be used in all new developments, with development expected to create a strong sense of place through drawing on the local context and being complimentary to the locality. Development will be required to be sensitive to all heritage assets and should enhance local distinctiveness by responding to the value of the historic environment. It would also be contrary to the principles set out in Section 16 of the Framework, which requires great weight to be given to heritage assets' conservation.

Other Matters

18. The appellant has expressed concerns regarding a lack of positive communication or pro-active working with the Council during the application process. Whilst I appreciate that this would have caused the appellant some frustration, it does not materially affect my consideration of the planning merits of the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

19. The appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations, including the approach of the Framework, worthy of sufficient weight, that would indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Laura Cuthbert

INSPECTOR