
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 5 November 2019

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd December 2019

Appeal A Ref: APP/V1505/W/19/3222518

The Hall, Church Road, Ramsden Bellhouse, Billericay, Essex, CM11 1RT.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Shaun Hannibal against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/01299/FULL, dated 18 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 23 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is a small single storey extension to the south west side of the main house.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/V1505/Y/19/3222921

The Hall, Church Road, Ramsden Bellhouse, Billericay, Essex, CM11 1RT.

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed buildings consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Shaun Hannibal against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/01300/LBBAS, dated 18 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 23 November 2018.
 - The works proposed are a small single storey extension to the south west side of the main house.
-

Decisions

Appeal A Ref: APP/V1505/W/19/3222518

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B Ref: APP/V1505/Y/19/3222921

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The appeal property is located in the Green Belt. However, the Council has determined that the proposed extension would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Accordingly, I consider the main issue, in this case, to be the effect of the proposed development on the special architectural and historic interest of the Hall listed Grade II.

Reasons

4. The Hall (Ramsden Bellhouse Hall) is a Grade II listed, timber-framed house. It is believed to date from the 16C, but re-fronted in brick during the 18C.

These works have resulted in the east and south elevations of the original dwelling having a formal appearance. This is in direct contrast to rear of the house, which has been altered, renovated and extended over the years, such that it now comprises a rich variety of architectural details, finishes, along with an eclectic mix of varying window styles, designs and proportions. This has resulted in the divergent and somewhat rural vernacular appearance of the rear.

5. From what I have seen and read the significance of this listed building is related to the history of its development and thereby its aesthetic and evidential value, in particular its original layout, form, historic fabric and detail all as suggested by the Council.
6. The appellant proposes the demolition of a 1930's addition to the rear and the construction of a new single storey extension.
7. The proposed extension would change the plan layout of the house to a very limited extent by the addition of a single new door opening between the existing kitchen and the new utility room. However, it would not impact on the relationship of the existing rooms, circulation routes or in any change to the layout of the principal rooms. Accordingly, I am not persuaded that the works would result in harm to the building's plan form as suggested by the Council.
8. The proposed addition, although comprising a number of small cellular spaces, has been designed in the form and style of a typical contemporary interpretation a historic orangery adapted to suit a smaller dwelling.
9. As designed the addition, due primarily to its three dimensional form, style and the proportion of the windows selected, would neither reflect the vernacular form and detail of the rear of the host property nor appear as a contrasting contemporary addition that might better reveal the historic building and its development. Furthermore, the proposed orangery would appear as a formal addition out of keeping with the organic rural vernacular appearance of the rear of the host property.
10. I appreciate that the design of the orangery might well be considered to reflect that of the re-fronted part of the house. However, due to it's location to the rear of the dwelling and being set well in from the south elevation it would not be read with that part of the house.
11. Accordingly, in my judgement, for these reasons it would appear as an awkward alien addition that would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of this heritage asset.
12. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, which include listed buildings. It draws a distinction between substantial harm and less than substantial harm to such an asset. For the latter, which applies here, the test is that the harm should be weighed against public benefits, including securing the optimum viable use.
13. The proposed extension would serve to ensure that the listed building remains relevant to family occupation of the dwelling and therefore its use for day-to-day living. This is clearly a public benefit. However, this benefit is plainly not wholly reliant on the proposed addition. Given the harm that has been identified I conclude that the public benefits would not outweigh this harm, or

the conflict with the Framework as it relates to the duties imposed by sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 in respect of the desirability of preserving listed buildings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

14. In reaching my determination I have been mindful that if this addition is not built then repairs to the existing fabric may well be necessary and that overall the proposal would only result in a modest addition to the dwelling. Nevertheless, for the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeals should fail.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR