

BEECH HILL 12/01596/HOUSE 12/01598/LBC2 Pins Ref 2188172 and 2188201	Forge, Beech Hill Road, Beech Hill Mrs S Petersen	Reconstruction and adaptation of existing outbuildings to provide additional living accommodation including conservatory and glazed link to main building.	Delegated Refusal	Dismissed 31.5.13
--	---	--	-------------------	----------------------

The Inspector considered that the main issue was the effect of the proposed works on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and its setting. It was noted that the existing form of the Forge and Smithy that have been conjoined into a dwelling via use of a glazed link is simple and easy to read. A substantial garden room to be linked to these structures via a conservatory would complicate the existing built form, making the Listed Building more difficult to read. The Inspector considered that this would overcomplicate the built form to the detriment of the Listed Building.

The applications also included proposals to redevelop outbuildings to the rear of the site to provide accommodation ancillary to the main dwelling. The Inspector noted that whilst the existing outbuildings were of low key, simple appearance, and no particular architectural merit, the proposed replacement buildings would be more complex in form and strident in their incongruity. It was considered that the buildings would compete with the Listed Building as the prime visual element on the site.

The Inspector concluded that the proposed works would not meet with requirements of the Act in respect of the preservation of Listed Buildings and would not meet with the aims of core Strategy Policies CS14 and CS19 in respect of ensuring the preservation of heritage assets and their settings. Additionally they would be at odds with paragraphs 132 and 134 of the NPPF which state that the conservation of heritage assets should be given great weight in planning decisions but that the impact on heritage assets should be weighed against the public benefit of proposed development, which in this case would be negligible. In light of these considerations the Inspector concluded that the appeals should not succeed.