

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2017

**by Cullum J A Parker BA(Hons) MA MRTPI IHBC**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 22<sup>nd</sup> August 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/Y/17/3170564**  
**47 Hutton Village, Hutton, CM13 1RU**

- 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 Tim Caira against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 16/01672/LBC, dated 29 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2017.
  - The works proposed are described as *'the proposal would be to apply for planning/listed building permissions to extend the existing premises by means of a new two storey side extension. The reason would be to create a larger kitchen and dining area at ground floor and increase the size of the existing two bedrooms at first floor. One of the bedrooms to include ensuite and closet. The design is to extend and not demolish the existing building. A degree of breakthrough opening to the side elevation would be required within the scheme.'*
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed works would preserve the Grade II listed building or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses.

## Reasons

3. The appeal building is listed Grade II and comprises a single dwelling, albeit a result of an earlier conversion of the building from two separate dwellings – as evidenced by the two front door openings to the front. The significance of the listed building derives in part from its aesthetic appearance. For example, when viewed from the front and side elevations it would be clear to the observer which parts constitute its historic heart. Whilst there is a two storey rear extension which most likely dates from a later period, this does not detract from the legibility of the oldest part of the building nor its plan form – although part has been lost on the rear elevation as shown on the submitted plans.
4. The proposal would see the removal of large parts of the side wall in order to erect a two storey side extension between the building and the detached garage. The proposed two storey extension would be set back from the front elevation and set down from the ridge height, thus giving it a subservient form. Nonetheless, it would require the removal of large parts of the existing side wall, make it hard for observers to appreciate the original location of the side wall by obscuring this, and adversely interrupt the internal plan form on both

the ground and first floors. As a result, the proposal would result in a negative impact on the significance of the listed building, which would fail to preserve its special interest.

5. The harm arising would be no more than less than substantial given that it would involve the loss of small parts of the buildings fabric and plan form. Nonetheless I am required to give substantial importance and weight to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, as set out in Section 16(2) of the PLBCA. The appellant has suggested that the proposed works would enable the creation of internal spaces which would be more practical to use. However, this is not a public benefit, and none have been suggested which would outweigh the less than substantial harm identified.
6. I note the examples pointed to by the appellant of other extensions within the locality. The evidence before me suggests that these date from the early to mid-1990s. I have not been provided with the full details of why those were considered acceptable by the decision-maker at that time. However, I have assessed this proposal on its own merits and found it unacceptable. I do not find that these examples provide an overriding justification for the approval of listed building consent in this case.
7. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to the provisions of Section 16(2) of the PLBCA. It would also be contrary to Policies C15 and CP1 of the *Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005* which amongst other aims seeks to ensure that proposals will only be permitted if it does not detract from the character of the listed building and takes account the need to conserve or enhance the historical heritage of the site. It would also conflict with the policies of the *National Planning Policy Framework* which include conserving heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.
8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

*Cullum J A Parker*

INSPECTOR