



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2020

**by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 10<sup>th</sup> February 2020**

---

## **Appeal A Ref: APP/C1570/W/19/3237369**

**Shamrock Cottage, Old Workhouse Yard, Great Easton, Dunmow, CM6 2HB**

- 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 Dobson against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
  - The application Ref UTT/19/1083/HHF, dated 9 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2019.
  - The development proposed is a single storey extension and replacement windows.
- 

## **Appeal B Ref: APP/C1570/Y/19/3237370**

**Shamrock Cottage, Old Workhouse Yard, Great Easton, Dunmow, CM6 2HB**

- 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 Dobson against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
  - The application Ref UTT/19/1084/LB, dated 9 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2019.
  - The works proposed are a single storey extension and replacement windows.
- 

## **Preliminary matters**

1. The submissions by the main parties make clear that the works the subject of this appeal relate to the erection of a rear extension and the replacement of windows in the southern, eastern and northern elevations, and I have determined this appeal on that basis. All of this work has been undertaken.

## **Decision Appeal A Ref: APP/C1570/W/19/3237369**

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension and replacement windows, at Shamrock Cottage, Old Workhouse Yard, Great Easton, Dunmow, CM6 2HB in accordance with the terms of the application Ref UTT/19/1083/HHF, dated 9 May 2019 subject to the following condition:
    - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans D/4352/19/EX-01, D/4352/19/PL-01 & D/4352/19/PL-02.
-

## **Decision Appeal B Ref: APP/C1570/Y/19/3237370**

3. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for a single storey extension and replacement windows, at Shamrock Cottage, Old Workhouse Yard, Great Easton, Dunmow, CM6 2HB in accordance with the terms of the application Ref UTT/19/1084/LB, dated 9 May 2019 and the plans submitted with it.

### **Main issue**

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building of Shamrock Cottage, and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

### **Reasons**

5. Shamrock Cottage dates from the 15<sup>th</sup> Century and is listed Grade II. The listing describes the building as being a hall of single storey with attics, and with a two storey cross-wing. The house is timber-framed with half-hipped and hipped roofs in peg tiles, with gable ends. A gabled dormer exists in the hall roof. The listing refers to the windows being 20<sup>th</sup> Century casements. I am informed these were fitted in the 1970s – before the listing of the property in 1983 – when the house and other neighbouring buildings were refurbished.
6. The house is an attractive example of a building from its age. I understand it was part of the grouping of buildings that formed the old workhouse in Great Easton, and together with the adjoining buildings the property forms a coherent collection of properties. The steeply pitched hipped tiled roofs, gable ends and substantial chimney stacks create a complex but pleasing form to this substantial house, which sits in harmony with its neighbours. The fenestration of the modern windows does not detract from this form and character. The significance of the building as a designated heritage asset thus comes from this appearance and group setting, and the age and historic association of the building.
7. The works comprising the rear extension and the replacement windows, the subject of these appeals, have been undertaken. I have been provided with a photograph of the front of the house in 2003 prior to the replacement of the windows, from which I can see the previous windows installed in the 1970s. This photograph also shows similar windows on the adjoining house, which I saw at my site visit still appear in place.
8. I am informed that the 1970s windows were painted softwood single-glazed, storm-bar casements. The appellant informs me that the replacement windows have replicated the fenestration of those windows, and are similarly softwood, storm casements; the sole difference being that they are now double-glazed. The Council consider the detailing of the new windows the subject of this appeal has changed, but based on my reading of the 2003 photograph and the evidence presented to me it appears to me that the fenestration has been accurately replicated in relation to those windows the subject of this appeal.
9. The Council state that the 1970s windows had a more traditional appearance, due to being single glazed and, they assume, puttied glazing bars. They raise an objection to the appearance caused by the double glazed units due to the different reflective qualities. I saw at my site visit that there is little difference

between the reflective qualities caused by the windows at Shamrock Cottage and that which occurs on the adjoining properties, which contain windows similar to that which previously existed. The small window panes and glazed areas are minor features within the overall architectural and historic interest of the property, and the very limited change in the reflective quality of those small panes does not affect that interest. There is also little perceptible difference arising from the glazing bars.

10. I note the Council's wish that the homeowner may have attempted to enhance the significance of the building by windows of a different appearance, compared to the 1970s window, and have referred to guidance from Historic England's *Traditional Windows; Their Care, Repair and Upgrading* publication. However, in this instance the fenestration of the replacement windows is not intrusive upon the architectural or historic interest of the property, or the neighbours, and the change to double glazing has little perceptible difference from single glazed windows.
11. The Council have not raised any objection to the rear extension, and I similarly consider it to be a modest addition that is in proportion in size and form to the host property.
12. The works therefore preserve the building's special architectural or historic interest, and so satisfy the statutory duty set out in s16(2) and s66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework says that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. In light of the above I conclude the works in this instance would not harm the significance of the Grade II listed building and so would not be in conflict with the Framework.
13. Thus, the works are not be in conflict with the Framework, and are consistent with Policy ENV2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (2005) which requires development affecting a listed building to be in keeping with its scale and character, and resists alterations that impair the special characteristics of a listed building.
14. The appeals are therefore allowed. As the works and extension have been undertaken and complete, there is no need to attach any conditions, save a condition on the grant of planning permission specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.

*C J Leigh*

INSPECTOR