



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 29 July 2008

by

Jane V Stiles BSc(Hons)Arch DipArch RIBA DipLA MLI PhD MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
17 November 2008

Appeal A: APP/J1915/C/08/2063627

Willow Pond House, Levens Green, Herts, SG11 1HD

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeal is made by Mr Matthew Windebank against an enforcement notice issued by East Hertfordshire District Council.
- The Council's reference is E/07/0240/B.
- The notice was issued on 17 December 2007.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission unauthorised development, involving extensions and works at the above site that materially differ to those granted permission under application number 3/02/2537/FP as detailed in Annex II attached to the Notice and as set out in Annex A to this decision.
- The requirements of the notice are to remove the unauthorised works and extensions to the listed building from the land and either (1) restore the building to its former condition or (2) make such physical changes as are necessary to ensure that the development accords to any extant planning permission, such as that granted under application number 3/02/2537/FP.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is 6 months.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (f) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. Since the prescribed fees have been paid within the specified period, the application for planning permission deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act as amended also falls to be considered.

Summary: the appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld as corrected in the terms set out below in the Formal Decision.

Appeal B: APP/J1915/F/08/2063623

Willow Pond House, Levens Green, Herts, SG11 1HD

- The appeal is made under section 39 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeal is made by Mr Matthew Windebank against a listed building enforcement notice issued by East Hertfordshire District Council.
- The Council's reference is E/07/0240/B.
- The notice was issued on 17 December 2007.
- The contravention of listed building control alleged in the notice is without listed building consent, unauthorised development involving extensions and works at the above site that materially differ to those granted listed building consent under application number 3/02/2538/LB as detailed in Annex II attached to the notice and as set out in Annex B attached to this decision.
- The requirements of the notice are to remove the unauthorised works and extensions to the listed building from the land and either (1) restore the building to its former condition or (2) make such physical changes as are necessary to ensure that the development accords to any extant listed building consent, such as that granted under application number 3/02/2538/LB. These works must include the reconstruction of the unlawfully removed pediment and associated fluted pilasters surrounding the front door

of the building, the replacement of the ground floor shutters and front door of the main house, these items being specifically noted in the building's listing.

- The period for compliance with the requirements is 6 months.
- The appeal is made on the grounds set out in section 39(1)(e) and (h) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.

Summary: The appeal is dismissed and the listed building enforcement notice is upheld as corrected in the terms set out below in the Formal Decision.

Procedural matters

1. Planning permission and listed building consent were granted on 9 February 2004 (Refs. 3/02/2537/FP & 3/02/2538/LB) for part demolition of a single storey element (which I shall call the side and rear wing), and construction of a two storey side extension with single storey garden room to rear. I shall call this Scheme A. To the rear of the pitched roof of the original dwelling was a part catslide roof and part flat roof. Scheme A showed the retention of the catslide roof, but the replacement of the flat roof with a new pitched roof. The ridge of the proposed side and rear wing was at a lower level than the main house (principal listed building) to ensure that the extension was subservient to it.
2. On 17 January 2005 an amended scheme (Drawing ref. AB9 rev L) was approved. These minor amendments comprised drawings to the garden room, the formation of a cellar, the addition of a new chimney, and a lowering of the extension roof and insertion of dormer windows. I shall call this Scheme B.
3. In May 2007, it became apparent to the Council that a number of outbuildings had been demolished, replacement outbuildings were being constructed, and the extensions to the main dwelling were not in accordance with either the originally approved drawings (i.e. Scheme A), or those agreed as a minor amendment (i.e. Scheme B). The appellant submitted both planning and listed building consent applications to regularise the situation; however both applications were refused and there are no appeals against those decisions before me.
4. Drawing No. 3157 AB9 Rev. L (Scheme B) refers to one of the side elevations of the garden room as 'south-west elevation' whereas it is the south-east elevation.
5. The appellant has submitted survey drawings of the development "as built". However, I saw on site that there are inaccuracies in these plans. For example, the survey plan does not show the correct alignment of the recessed steps in the dais leading to the door in the link; the end (north-west) elevation of the garden room shows 4 panels of glass not 3 and it does not show the correct relationship between garden room and adjoining flue/chimney.
6. The appellant has shown a willingness to:
 - re-construct the removed pediment and associated fluted pilasters surrounding the front door; remove the bracketed canopy and re-instate the approach step to the main house;

- Replace the front door (6 panel including 2 windows) of the main house;
 - Remove the 2 conservation/Velux roof lights in the new porch;
 - Remove the triangular windows in the north-eastern elevation;
 - Replace the louvered shutters to the ground floor of the main house
 - Make changes to the rear garden room extension so that it no longer interferes with the roof of the main building
7. Drawing Nos. APP1, APP2, and APP3 submitted with the appeal purport to show the development "as built" with the exception of the above identified reinstatement and amendment works. The appellant requests that planning permission be granted on the basis of these plans. However, because these plans are based on inaccurate survey plans, they too are inaccurate. Furthermore, I have only jurisdiction to consider granting planning permission deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act as amended for the development to which the notice relates and listed building consent for the retention of the works carried out in contravention of section 9 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended. The proposed amendments would therefore have to be the subject of fresh applications for planning permission and listed building consent.

The Enforcement Notice

8. Annex II of the notice is defective in that the heading refers to *listed building consent under application number 3/02/253/FP*. Clearly the words 'listed building consent' should read 'planning permission'. However, as this is apparent from the heading to the notice as well as Article 3, I do not consider the error to be fatal to the notice. I am therefore satisfied that I can exercise my power to correct the allegation without giving rise to an injustice.
9. Article 5 of the Enforcement Notice is also defective in that it is insufficiently clear what is required. I shall re-word it to require the appellant to: *Remove the unauthorised works and extensions to the listed building from the land and either (1) restore the building to its former authorised state or (2) bring the building to the state in which it would have been if the terms and conditions of any planning permission which has been granted for the works had been complied with*. However, as the intention is clear, I do not consider the error to be fatal to the notice. I am therefore satisfied that I can exercise my power to correct the requirements without giving rise to an injustice.

Listed Building Enforcement Notice

10. Similarly, Article 5 of the Enforcement Notice is also defective in that it is insufficiently clear what is required. I shall re-word it to require the appellant to: *Remove the unauthorised works and extensions to the listed building from the land and either (1) restore the building to its former authorised state or (2) bring the building to the state in which it would have been if the terms and conditions of any listed building consent which has been granted for the works had been complied with. These works must include the reconstruction of the unlawfully removed pediment and associated fluted pilasters surrounding the front door of the building, the replacement of the ground floor shutters and front door of the main house, these items being specifically noted in the*

building's list description. However, as the intention is clear, I do not consider the error to be fatal to the notice. I am therefore satisfied that I can exercise my power to correct the allegation without giving rise to an injustice.

Main issue

11. The main issue in both appeals is the effect of the works on the special architectural or historic interest of the Grade II listed building, Willow Pond House, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Reasons

Appeal A Ground (a) – planning permission should be granted for what is alleged in the notice; and Appeal B Ground (e) that listed building consent ought to be granted for the works;

12. The appellant's arguments in respect of Appeal A ground (a) and Appeal B ground (e) are linked. I shall therefore deal with them together.
13. Willow Pond House has been listed in Grade II. The list description says that it comprises an 18th Century, or earlier, house of timber frame plastered with stucco plinth beneath a steeply pitched roof of old red clay tiles. The house faces west, it is of 2-storeys and has a symmetrical front, 3 windows long with a central door up 4 steps. The door itself is described as 6-panel moulded door with fluted pilasters to pedimented doorcase. To the rear, the house has an outshut with a catslide roof and a shallower wing to the right hand (i.e. south). It has a projecting gable chimney to the north end and a smaller central chimney next to the junction of the narrower south wing. It has flush box sash windows with moulded surrounds but 19th Century replacement divided sashes and louvered shutters to ground floor. I saw on site that the ridge steps down beyond the central chimney reflecting the shallower depth of the right hand wing.
14. At my site visit the appellant showed me an old photograph of the entrance door and steps and the Council showed me a photograph of the front of the house prior to alteration. From this photographic evidence, the original door was of 4 solid panels and 2 glazed panels and was approached by 4 stone steps, with the width of the top 3 steps increasing incrementally from top to bottom and all but the lowest tread returning back to the house in front of the step above it. The bottom tread was triangular in shape to follow the alignment of the driveway so that the right end was towards the apex of the triangle, the left end formed the base of the triangle and the riser formed the hypotenuse of the triangle. In addition, the Council's photograph showed that there were shutters to the ground floor windows. As noted, on the list description, both photographs showed the front entrance had a 6 panelled moulded door with fluted pilasters to a pedimented doorcase.

The front of the main house

15. PPG15 at paragraph C.9 says that door and window openings establish the character of an elevation; they should not generally be altered in their proportions or details, especially where they are a conspicuous element of the design. Paragraph C.37 says that original doorways and any surviving original

doors should be retained. Their replacement is often entirely unnecessary. Domestic doors vary widely and if they have to be replaced their design should be appropriate to the character of the building. Replacement doors should copy the original in the materials, the detail of the design, and the paint finish. Modern, off-the-peg doors are not generally acceptable for use in listed buildings. Unpainted hardwood or stained or varnished softwood doors are rarely suitable. Paragraph C.39 says that, amongst other things, doorcases, pediments, columns, pilasters should not be removed or mutilated but retained. Paragraph C.51 says that old louvered external shutters are important features and often contribute to the design of an elevation.

16. In this case, the pediment and associated fluted pilasters surrounding the front door have been removed and they have been replaced with a bracketed canopy. The 6-panelled front door (which included 2 glazed lights) has been removed and replaced with a stained, plank door with a viewing panel with 4 panes of glass. The alterations to the front door have not only resulted in the loss of the central feature of special architectural and historic interest from the principal elevation of the listed building but also its replacement with features which are out of character with the original 18th Century building. Furthermore, the removal of the louvered shutters to the ground floor windows has robbed the elevation of an important feature which contributed to the integrity of its character and design.
17. Both enforcement notices refer to the removal of the approach step to the main house. It seems to me that from what I saw on site and from the photographic evidence, the large triangular bottom step has been cut to form a more rectilinear tread and to accommodate a change in the alignment of the driveway. Although this may seem to be individually of little importance, it has not only resulted in the loss of historic fabric, but also it is part of a package of changes to the dominant feature of the principal elevation which are cumulatively very destructive of the building's special interest.

Floor layout of link and rear wing

18. It is clear from the ground floor plan of the existing building that the original rear wing was set at an obtuse angle to the rear of the frontage building. Having had regard to PPG15 at paragraphs C.2 and C.58, this angular relationship was an important characteristic in the special interest of the building. Furthermore, this angle was retained in both sets of approved plans (i.e. Schemes A and B); and both schemes proposed a new 2-storey wing of accommodation to be built on the footprint of the existing single storey utility and games rooms thereby retaining as much historic fabric as practical as advised in PPG15 paragraph C.3.
19. However, a completely new rear wing has been built, which is set at right angles to the frontage building; it is about 0.8m wider and about 2.5m longer than either of the proposed Schemes A or B. As a consequence, the historic layout has been lost; historic fabric has been lost; and the resulting rear wing appears to have a more cramped relationship to the dwelling house to its detriment.

New chimney to rear wing

20. Scheme B indicated a new chimney to be built against the gable end of the rear wing. However, one of the consequences of the rear wing having been built longer is that the chimney now falls within the building but in close proximity to the gable. As such, it appears to be a non-traditional and incongruous addition.

The front elevation of link to rear wing

21. Schemes A and B both indicated a link between the main house and the rear wing on the footprint of the existing single storey building. The existing ground floor plan, the Scheme A ground floor plan, and the Scheme B ground floor plan all show a slight set-back from the front of the rear wing and the front of the link at the change of angle between the two, such that the rear wing would be proud of the link. Schemes A and B both show a gable to the front of the rear wing; and both schemes show the ridge line of the link to be below the lower of the 2 ridges of the main house. Scheme A had the ridge of the rear wing at the same level as the link, whereas Scheme B had the ridge of the rear wing below the ridge of the link.
22. In both Scheme A and Scheme B the north-east elevation of the main building and link showed a ridge line which stepped down twice from the catslide roof to the rear of the main house. As built, this elevation now has a continuous ridge line. The straight ridge detracts from the scale and appearance of the principal listed building. In particular, from the front of the building where the new ridge is higher than the lower section of ridge on the main house.
23. PPG15 at paragraph C.21 says that where new porches are considered acceptable, their design should be undemonstrative and should not challenge the integrity of the façade. In this case, both approved schemes indicated a pitched roof canopy style porch over a 4-panelled door into the link with a threshold at ground level. However, the scheme as built has a very confused elevation to the front of the link and the rear wing (the south-western elevation).
24. First, instead of the link being set back from the front of the rear wing, it is set forwards of it. At roof level this results in the front roof slope of the link over-sailing the gable of the wing. The eaves also over-sails the link and is supported by a chunky, curved, timber bracing member. Secondly, the ridge of the link is above the level of the adjacent ridge of the main roof. Thirdly, there is a totally different fenestration with a different arrangement of windows, different sizes of windows, different styles of window, and a different entrance door. Notably, the windows are casement windows, not sash windows; and the door is a stained plank door with a large 4-light glazed panel above waist height. Fourthly, instead of a small porch with a pitched roof over the doorway, there is a monopitched canopy across the full width of the link which itself has 2 Velux type roof lights and which is supported on a chunky timber frame comprising 3 posts and 2 curved bracing members (similar to the one at eaves level). The porch sits on a raised dais of stone flags supported on a dwarf brick wall. The paved element sweeps around in a curve to extend to almost the full width of the gable end of the main house to its left end; it has 2 recessed steps (up) in front of the entrance door to the link; and it has 2 steps up at its right end with the lower tread being semi-circular in shape.

25. In combination, the foregoing features result in a confused and inappropriate façade which challenges the integrity of the main façade of the principal listed building.

Dormers on the rear wing

26. The dormer windows in the north-west and south-east elevations of the rear wing extension are set higher up in the roof than shown on the approved drawings for Scheme B. The dormers no longer cross the eaves/gutter line so that the gutter is now in one section which passes in front of the base of the dormer. The apexes of the gabled dormers are much closer to the ridge line giving greater prominence. Furthermore, all of the dormer windows were proposed to be sash windows whereas they are built with casement windows.

North-east (i.e. gable end) elevation of rear wing

27. The north-east gable end elevation of the rear wing has 4 windows – 2 triangular windows to the underside of the roof slope, and 2 small arch topped windows to the ground floor. Both sets of windows are out of keeping both with the listed building itself, and the alterations which were approved by the Council. By contrast there were no windows in the approved plans as the building was designed to butt up against an existing timber barn.

North-west elevation of rear wing

28. The size and composition of the ground floor fenestration to the north western elevation of the rear wing differs from the approved plans. In Scheme B all new windows were to be traditional sliding sash to match the existing house whereas they are casement windows.

Garden room

29. PPG15 at paragraph C.7 says that modern extensions should not dominate the existing building in either scale, material or situation. Successful extensions require the application of an intimate knowledge of the building type that is being extended together with a sensitive handling of scale and detail.
30. From the existing floor plans, the garden room is an entirely new feature. Scheme A indicated a pitched roof garden room whose ridge was well below the eaves of the catslide roof to the rear of the main house. The gable end contained 2 No. 2 pane windows and one 4-pane window separated by mullions.
31. Scheme B indicated a garden room set about 2 steps down from the garden level. It would have had a hipped pitched roof of a steeper pitch than Scheme A, with its ridge just clearing the eaves of the catslide roof. It would have been comprised of a dwarf brick wall with tall, narrow panels of glazing such that the north-west side of the garden room would have contained 8 panels, the south-east side 6 panels with a pair of glazed double doors, and the north-east end, 6 panels.
32. However, the garden room which has been built is very different from either Scheme A or Scheme B. The roof height has been raised above the eaves line of the catslide roof and cuts into the main roof of the listed building. Two rear house windows have been removed (whereas in Schemes A and B, 2 existing

windows would have been reduced in size); and 3 rooflights have been inserted into the catslide roof. The door/window configuration of all 3 walls of the garden room has been altered from both Schemes A and B. The south-east elevation contains 2 glazed panels either side of a pair of double doors; the north-east elevation contains 4 glazed panels with stained timber mullions. The length of the garden room exceeds that granted consent by about 0.5m. The ground floor level of the finished slab of the garden room has not been reduced as shown on the approved drawings for Scheme B.

33. The garden room, as built, has badly proportioned windows and doors; and because of its size and situation it results in an over-dominant roof which detracts from the catslide roof and dominates the rear of the listed building. Furthermore, the scale of the garden room has resulted in the loss of rear windows which appears to have necessitated the addition of the 3 rooflights in the catslide roof of the main building which I do not consider preserve the character of the listed building.

Doors, windows and materials

34. Many doors and windows, including dormer windows in the extensions are not in the positions indicated on the approved plans and an additional roof light has been added to the lengthened rear wing extension. Furthermore, the materials used in the extensions have not been approved by the local planning authority. Whilst the Council is of the view that the materials and general quality of the works are of a high standard, this is not sufficient to overcome the harm to the listed building caused by the scale, style and design of the extensions.

Conclusion on ground (a) and (e) appeals

35. In my conclusion the works the subject of Appeals A and B, both individually and in combination, fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building in conflict with national and local policy. The s174 appeal on ground (a) and the s39 appeal on ground (e) therefore both fail.

Appeal A ground (f) – the steps required to comply with the requirements of the notice are excessive and lesser steps would overcome the objections.

36. The appellant considers that lesser steps are required to comply with the requirements of the Enforcement Notice. However, first, I do not consider that the removal of the 2 Velux rooflights from the new porch would overcome the large number of concerns which I have with the development as carried out in respect of the side and rear wing. Secondly, the removal of the 2 triangular windows would not overcome my concerns in relation to the rear wing.
37. As I have already stated, I am unable to consider the proposed alterations to the roof of the garden room put forward by the appellant which include the introduction of a hipped end to the side which abuts the main house.
38. For the foregoing reasons, the works (or lesser steps) which the appellant has suggested would not be sufficient to overcome my objections to those specific elements of the works; and the remaining works which are proposed for retention would clearly fail to preserve the listed building for the reasons which I have stated. It follows therefore that the s174 appeal on ground (f) also fails.

Appeal A ground (g) – that the time given to comply with the notice is too short: and Appeal B ground (h) – that the period specified in the notice as the period within which any step required by the notice is to be taken falls short of what should reasonably be allowed.

39. From the evidence before me, 6 months is a reasonable time in which to carry out the requirements of the notices. Although the appellant notes that the works which have been carried out were completed over a period of 3 years, there could be any number of reasons why this was so. As such, it does not, by itself, explain why the requirements of the notice could not be carried out within 6 months and he has not put forward any other specific or convincing reason why the requirements could not be achieved. Should any new circumstances be explained to the Council, it has powers under s173A(1)(b) of T&CP Act (Appeal A) to extend the compliance period, whether or not the notice has taken effect; and under s38(5)(b) of the P(LB&CA) Act (Appeal B) to relax any requirement of a listed building enforcement notice and, in particular it may extend the period specified in accordance with s38(3) of that Act. As the period in the 2 notices is adequate, the s174 appeal on ground (g) and the s39 appeal on ground (h) must fail.

Conclusions

40. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeals should not succeed. I shall uphold the listed building enforcement notice with corrections and the enforcement notice with corrections and refuse to grant planning permission on the deemed application.

Formal Decisions

Appeal A

41. I direct that the enforcement notice be corrected by:

- i) Deleting the words 'listed building consent' from the heading of Annex II and inserting the words 'planning permission'.
- ii) Deleting from article 5 the words '(1) restore the building to its former condition' and insert the words '(1) *restore the building to its former authorised state*'.
- iii) Deleting from article 5 the words '(2) make such physical changes as are necessary to ensure that the development accords to any extant planning permission, such as that granted under application number 3/02/2437/FP' and inserting the words '(2) *bring the building to the state in which it would have been if the terms and conditions of any planning permission which has been granted for the works had been complied with*'

Subject to these corrections I dismiss the appeal, uphold the enforcement notice, and refuse to grant planning permission on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

Appeal B

42. I direct that the listed building enforcement notice be corrected by deleting from article 5 the words '(1) restore the building to its former condition or (2)

make such physical changes as are necessary to ensure that the development accords to any extant listed building consent, such as that granted under application number 3/02/2528/LB' and inserting the words '(1) restore the building to its former authorised state or (2) to bring the building to the state in which it would have been if the terms and conditions of any listed building consent which has been granted for the works had been complied with'.

Subject to these corrections, I dismiss the appeal and uphold the listed building enforcement notice, and refuse listed building consent for the retention of the works carried out in contravention of section 9 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.

Jane V Stiles

INSPECTOR

APPEAL A – ANNEX A

Annex II (works at Willow Pond House, Levens Green that materially differ to those granted listed building consent under application number 3/02/2537/FP)

- 1) Three rooflights have been inserted in the slate catslide roof to the rear of the listed main house adjacent to the garden room.
- 2) The roof height of the garden room has been raised above the eaves line and appears to cut into the main roof of the listed building. Two rear house windows have been removed by infilling the spandrel between the roof slope and eaves.
- 3) The dormer windows on the north-west and south-east elevations of the new extension are set higher up in the roof than shown on the approved drawings and are no longer divided by the gutter/eaves line. The window sill line now aligns with the gutter/eaves and the apexes of the gabled dormers are much closer to the ridge line, giving greater prominence.
- 4) The door/window configuration of the south-west elevation of garden room has been altered from the approved plans and a reduced number of glazed panels and mullions fitted.
- 5) The length of the garden room exceeds that granted permission/consent by 0.5 metre.
- 6) The ground floor level of the finished slab of the garden room has not been reduced as shown on the approved drawings.
- 7) The main storey extension has a different orientation from that approved and the apparent right angled juxtaposition results in a more cramped relationship to the dwellinghouse, to its detriment.
- 8) The two storey extension is approximately 2.5 metres longer and 0.8 metre wider than the approved development.
- 9) The extension, as viewed from the north-east elevation, was shown on the approved plans as having a stepped ridge line which drops for part of its length. The constructed extension has a straight ridge.
- 10) The rear extended wing of the house, as viewed from the north-east, has four windows inserted therein; the approved plans had no such details as the building was designed to butt against an existing timber barn.
- 11) A further unauthorised porch, with rooflights therein, has been added to the new doorway to the south western elevation of the extension.
- 12) The configuration and detail of the roof structures and fenestration on the

extended section of the south western elevation differ from those shown on the approved plans apparently due to the stepping back of the south eastern ridge roofed element.

- 13) The size and composition of the ground floor fenestration to the north western elevation extension differs from the approved plans.
- 14) The materials used in the extensions are not approved by the local planning authority and detract from the listed main building.
- 14) The windows fitted to the extensions are in a casement form and not sash windows, as approved.
- 15) Many doors and windows (including some dormers) in the extensions are not in the positions indicated on the approved plans and an additional rooflight has been added in the lengthened extension.

APPEAL B – ANNEX B

Annex II (works at Willow Pond House, Levens Green that materially differ to those granted listed building consent under application number 3/02/2538/LB)

- 1) The removal of the pediment and associated fluted pilasters surrounding the front door of the building and the provision of an unauthorised bracketed canopy.*
- 2) The removal of the 6 panel front door, including two windows, and its replacement with a plank door with a viewing panel.*
- 3) The removal of the louvered shutters to the ground floor of the listed building.*
- 4) The removal of the approach step to the main house.
- 5) Three rooflights have been inserted in the slate catslide roof to the rear of the listed main house adjacent to the garden room.
- 6) The roof height of the garden room has been raised above the eaves line and appears to cut into the main roof of the listed building. Two rear house windows have been removed by infilling the spandrel between the roof slope and eaves.
- 7) The dormer windows on the north-west and south-east elevations of the new extension are set higher up in the roof than shown on the approved drawings and are no longer divided by the gutter/eaves line. The window sill line now aligns with the gutter/eaves and the apexes of the gabled dormers are much closer to the ridge line, giving greater prominence.
- 8) The door/window configuration of the south-west elevation of garden room has been altered from the approved plans and a reduced number of glazed panels and mullions fitted.
- 9) The length of the garden room exceeds that granted permission/consent by 0.5 metre.
- 10) The ground floor level of the finished slab of the garden room has not been reduced as shown on the approved drawings.
- 11) The main storey extension has a different orientation from that approved and the apparent right angled juxtaposition results in a more cramped relationship to the dwellinghouse, to its detriment.
- 12) The two storey extension is approximately 2.5 metres longer and 0.8 metre wider than the approved development.
- 13) The extension, as viewed from the north-east elevation, was shown on the approved plans as having a stepped ridge line which drops for part of its length. The constructed extension has a straight ridge.

- 14) The rear extended wing of the house, as viewed from the north-east, has four windows inserted therein; the approved plans had no such details as the building was designed to butt against an existing timber barn.
- 15) A further unauthorised porch, with rooflights therein, has been added to the new doorway to the south western elevation of the extension.
- 16) The configuration and detail of the roof structures and fenestration on the extended section of the south western elevation differ from those shown on the approved plans apparently due to the stepping back of the south eastern ridge roofed element.
- 17) The size and composition, of the ground floor fenestration to the north western elevation extension differs from the approved plans.
- 18) The materials used in the extensions are not approved by the local planning authority and detract from the listed main building.
- 19) The windows fitted to the extensions are in a casement form and not sash windows, as approved.
- 20) Many doors and windows (including some dormers) in the extensions are not in the positions indicated on the approved plans and an additional rooflight has been added in the lengthened extension.

*= items specifically mentioned in the listing.