



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2017

by Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 29th January 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/Y/17/3179267

Brickhouse Farm, Brickhouse Road, Colne Engaine CO6 2HJ

- 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 and Mrs Assouline against the decision of Braintree District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00050/LBC, dated 12 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2017.
 - The works proposed are single storey rear extension within existing courtyard.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for a single storey rear extension within existing courtyard at Brickhouse Farm, Brickhouse Road, Colne Engaine CO6 2HJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 17/00050/LBC, dated 12 January 2017, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) No works shall commence unless and until samples of the materials to be used on the external finishes have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details
 - 3) No works shall commence unless and until additional drawings that show details of proposed new windows, doors, eaves, verges and cills to be used by section and elevation at scales between 1:20 and 1:1 as appropriate have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be permanently retained as such.

Procedural Matters

2. There appears to have been an associated planning application for the same proposal with the reference 17/00049/FUL. However, the documents submitted with this appeal relate to the refused listed building consent application only. Therefore, I have only had regard to this application in my decision and have only granted listed building consent, not planning permission. Planning permission may also be required before the proposed works can commence. This would be a matter for the appellant and the Council to address.

3. The Council's reason for refusal refers to effects on the conservation area, but following my request the Council has confirmed that the property is not within a conservation area. The appellant's appeal form indicates that the site is within the Green Belt, but the Council has also confirmed that no Green Belt designation applies.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposed works would preserve the Grade II listed building known as Brickhouse Farmhouse or any features of architectural or historic interest it possesses.

Reasons

5. Brickhouse Farmhouse is a Grade II listed building that dates from the late 16th century although incorporates medieval elements and was altered in the 19th century. The main house is a sizeable two storey building with painted plastered brickwork and timber framing and a large clay tiled roof. Internally are various architectural features of interest. Viewed from the road and garden, the house is an imposing and attractive building with a number of fine details including timber windows and doors and brick chimneys. There is a single small casement window on the otherwise blank rear elevation of the main house, which emphasises the imposing scale and mass of the main house when seen from the rear. When viewed from the ground floor hallway, it is evident that this window was previously a doorway due to variations in the plasterwork and an old timber lintel above. The architectural qualities of the property thus make an important contribution to the special interest of the listed building and its significance.
6. At the rear are two single storey pitched roof wings built in the 19th and 20th centuries that project a considerable distance from the main house and create a courtyard at the rear. Their height, width and siting are sufficiently subservient so as not to detract from the scale of the main house or prevent an understanding of its earlier form. They have architectural merit in themselves in terms of materials and detailing such as the chimneys, and form part of the building's evolution. A modern brick and glazed porch on the north elevation of the southern wing and a boiler room adjacent to the northern wing have limited architectural merit and so detract to some extent from the overall composition of the rear elevation.
7. The proposed works would infill a large part of the courtyard between the two later extensions to form a garden room. However, it would not project as deeply as the existing two wings or be as tall with a similar eaves height. The flat roof and lantern would minimise the overall height, while the use of large amount of glazing would lessen the overall bulk. Painted hardwood joinery would complement the materials on the existing house. The lantern would have a rather modern appearance but would be wholly glazed and lightweight. Thus, due to the restrained size, scale and design of the proposed works, the imposing scale and mass of the main house when seen from the rear would still be evident and it would still be possible to understand its earlier form. The cumulative effect of the works alongside the existing two wings would not be unacceptable.
8. There would be some loss of fabric to turn the casement window into a doorway, but this would be offset by the evidence of a previous doorway and

the removal of the modern porch and boiler room at the rear. The appellant indicates that the new opening would be formed in oak which could be controlled by means of a condition.

9. In conclusion, the proposed works would have little adverse effect on the architectural or historic interest of the listed building and the overall composition and appearance of the building would be safeguarded. Therefore, the special interest of the listed building would be preserved in line with Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. There would be no harm to its significance and its conservation would be assured as required by paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
10. In coming to this conclusion, I have had regard to Policy CS9 of the Braintree Core Strategy 2011 and Policies RLP18, RLP90 and RLP100 of the Braintree District Local Plan Review 2005. These policies seek to protect the historic environment and avoid harm to listed buildings as well as requiring extensions to be subordinate to, and compatible with the scale and character of, the existing dwelling and surrounding area.
11. The Council highlights the process of the Publication Draft Local Plan (PDLP) which has been submitted for examination. The Council states that some weight can be afforded to the PDLP. Thus, in coming to my conclusion, I have also had regard to relevant policies in the PDLP which, amongst other things, seek to protect heritage assets and ensure extensions are subordinate to the original dwelling.

Conditions

12. A condition setting a time limit for the commencement of the works is necessary for clarity and compliance, while the formal decision requires the works to be in accordance with the submitted plans. Conditions requiring samples of materials and additional drawings showing details of specific features are necessary to ensure that the works have an acceptable effect on the special interest of the listed building.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge

INSPECTOR