



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 12 November 2019

by Thomas Shields MA DipURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 January 2020

Appeal A: APP/W0530/Y/18/3212595

8 Hall Farm Barns, Hunts Lane, Hinxton, Saffron Walden, CB10 1SG

- 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 & Mrs A N Cliffe against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref: S/1248/18/LB, dated 28 March 2018, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2018.
 - The works proposed are proposed rooflights in south facing elevation and landscaped front garden to include trellising and block/brick paved paths and planters.
-

Appeal B: APP/W0530/W/18/3213707

8 Hall Farm Barns, Hunts Lane, Hinxton, Saffron Walden, CB10 1SG

- 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 & Mrs A N Cliffe against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref: S/4473/17/FL, dated 12 December 2017, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2018.
 - The development proposed is rooflights in south facing elevation and landscaped front garden to include trellising and block/brick paved paths and planters.
-

Decisions

1. **Appeal A** is dismissed.
2. **Appeal B** is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed rooflights in the south facing elevation. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the proposed landscaping. Planning permission is granted for landscaped front garden to include trellising and block/brick paved paths and planters at 8 Hall Farm Barns, Hunts Lane, Hinxton, Saffron Walden, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. S/4473/17/FL, dated 12 December 2017, and the plans submitted with it so far as they are relevant to those parts of the development hereby permitted.

Preliminary Matter

3. The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (LP) was adopted in 2018. Consequently, I attach full weight to Policy NH/14 which was previously an emerging policy when the Council determined the applications.

Main Issue

4. The proposed landscaping to the front garden, comprising trellising and block and brick paths and planters, does not require listed building consent. Appeal A therefore only relates to the proposed rooflights. In Appeal B the Council do not object to the proposed landscaping and I have no reason to disagree.
5. Therefore, the main issue common to both appeals is the effect of the proposed rooflights on the special architectural and historic interest (the significance) of the Grade II listed building and whether they would preserve the character or appearance of the Hinxton Conservation Area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property, 8 Hall Farm Barns, is one of a number of curtilage listed barns associated with Hall Farmhouse, a Grade II listed building (Listing Ref: 1164679). The barns, including the appeal property, are of a simple rectilinear design with pitched roof. Their simple form reflects their historical status and relationship, as secondary ancillary and functional buildings, associated with the more substantial and primary building of Hall Farmhouse. They have been converted to residential use in recent years.
7. While I acknowledge there has been a degree of compromise during their conversion, in order to facilitate modern residential use and thereby their longevity, it is clear to me that the hierarchical relationship of simple secondary buildings with the primary listed building nonetheless remains clear and evident. The long uninterrupted plane of the roof, devoid of openings or other features is integral to the historical character and appearance of the barn, and its relationship with Hall Farmhouse. These factors are integral and important to the building's significance as a designated heritage asset.
8. I consider that the insertion of the rooflights, as proposed, would be an obvious intrusion into the roof form. They would visibly, and hence harmfully, dilute its appearance and relationship as a secondary building. Moreover, it would harm the historic and architectural character of the roof form which still remains unbroken. For the same reasons I find that the proposal would also fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Hinxton Conservation Area, also being a designated heritage asset. While I note the presence of the rooflight at No. 10 that does not provide justification for this proposal which would result in the harm I have identified.
9. The harm resulting from the proposed rooflights would be less than substantial in terms of paragraph 195 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) (NPPF). Thus, the harm should be weighed against any public benefits.
10. The optimum viable use of the building as a residential dwelling is already secured and the attic room the proposed windows would serve has already been constructed. Consequently, I am not persuaded that the proposed windows are necessary to make the property viable for living or that alternative internal lighting would not be an adequate alternative.
11. Taking account of all these factors, I conclude that the harm to the significance of the heritage assets would not be outweighed by any public benefits. As such, there would be conflict with the provisions of paragraph 193 of the NPPF which states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the

asset's conservation. The proposed rooflights would also conflict with LP Policy NH/14.

Conclusion

12. For all the above reasons, I dismiss both appeals in respect of the proposed rooflights, but allow in part Appeal B insofar as it relates to the proposed garden landscaping.

Thomas Shields

INSPECTOR