



Appeal Decision

by Mr A Thickett BA (Hons) BTP Dip RSA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 10/01/2023

Appeal reference: CAS-01991-W8D7P7

Site address: New House Farm, Llangybi, Monmouthshire, NP15 1NP

- 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 R Harry against the decision of Monmouthshire County Council.
 - The application Ref DM/2021/01628, dated 29 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2021.
 - The works proposed are the installation of two rooflights within the roof of the listed property on its rear elevation at second floor level (loft space), the installation of a further two rooflights to a mid-century extension and the replacement of an existing roof light.
 - A site visit was made on 8 December 2022.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have amended the appellants description of the works by removing superfluous text.
3. All the rooflights subject to this appeal are in situ. Listed building consent was granted for the insertion of rooflights to the main roof and a later extension to the rear in 2019. The consent was subject to a condition requiring the rooflights to be flush to the roof pitch, with no greater upstand than 25mm above the slate. Further, that the specifications of the rooflights should be agreed with the Council before they were fitted. The appellant did not comply with the condition. The appeal application seeks to retain the rooflights as fitted and a rooflight inserted in the south facing roof slope of an offshoot from the main house and later extension.
4. This rooflight replaced a glass tile which sat within the slate roof. It provided illumination but did not open. The appellant claims the roof around the glass tile was leaking and needed to be replaced. Whilst this may be the case, given Building Regulations exemptions can be made in relation to works to listed buildings, I have seen nothing to indicate a like for like repair was not possible. It has not been shown that replacing the glass tile with the much bulkier, opening rooflight was the minimum necessary in the interests of safety or health or for the preservation of the building. I do not agree,

therefore, that the works to replace the glass tile find support under Section 9(3) of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the impact of the rooflights on the special architectural and historic interest of New House Farm, a Grade II* listed building.

Reasons

6. According to the listing description New House Farm dates to around 1700 and has been altered very little since. The house is rendered and whitewashed over local rubblestone and has Welsh slate roofs with ridge tiles and red brick stacks. It has large and small rear wings, one of which is partly original and there is also a single storey addition to the left hand gable. The building has been listed Grade II* due to its *'fine design and exceptionally unaltered state including such features as original doors and ironmongery. This house is a classic example of its type.'*
7. Prior to the installation of the rooflights, the roofs to the main house and rear additions remained unaltered and their simple, plain unspoilt appearance is a significant contributor to the architectural and historic interest of this Grade II* listed building. I acknowledge consent was granted for rooflights in these roof slopes but the final details were not approved. The extent to which the frames extend and break above the roof slopes calls attention to these modern and uncharacteristic features in a building of this age. As fitted the rooflights are significant and adverse interruptions in the historic plain and simple form of the roofs, to the detriment of the special architectural and historic interest of New House Farm.
8. The appellant takes issue with the Council's objections in relation to the design, finish and size of the roof lights compared to the permitted scheme but the precise specifications were not agreed as required by condition. Further, notwithstanding any other matters, on its own, the harm caused by the extent to which the frames protrude above the roof slopes provides compelling grounds to dismiss this appeal.
9. Whilst the appearance of the front of the house may be the main reason for listing and the roof may have been replaced due to fire damage, the whole of the building is listed Grade II*. Nor does it matter that the rear of the building is not visible from public viewpoints, it can be seen from the surrounding properties. The appellant points to similar rooflights installed in other listed properties nearby but I am not aware of the details of these cases. In this case, the duty to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of this Grade II* building rests with me and I find the rooflights do neither.

Conclusion

10. I have seen nothing to suggest that the existing roof lights are the only way of providing a means of escape. The appellant's claims of alleged favourable treatment of applications made by people employed by or associated with the Council are not within my remit. For the reasons given above and having regard to all matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.
11. In reaching my decision, 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 this decision is in accordance with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards making our cities, towns and villages even better places in which to live and work.

A Thickett

Inspector