



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 8 July 2021

by Graham Chamberlain BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 JULY 2021

Appeal A - Ref: APP/C1570/W/20/3264002

The Barn, Evelyn Road, Willows Green, Essex CM3 1QQ

- 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 James Parker against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/20/2319/HHF, dated 14 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Single storey glass flat roofed extension to kitchen wing of barn conversion'.
-

Appeal B - Ref: APP/C1570/Y/20/3264006

The Barn, Evelyn Road, Willows Green, Essex CM3 1QQ

- 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 James Parker against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/20/2320/LB, dated 14 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 November 2020.
 - The proposed works are described as 'Single storey glass flat roofed extension to kitchen wing of barn conversion'.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A – The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey glass flat roofed extension to the kitchen wing at The Barn, Evelyn Road, Willows Green, Essex CM3 1QQ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: UTT/20/2319/HHF, dated 14 September 2020, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.
2. Appeal B - The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for a single storey glass flat roofed extension to the kitchen wing at The Barn, Evelyn Road, Willows Green, Essex CM3 1QQ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: UTT/20/2320/LB, dated 14 September 2020, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have considered the two appeals concurrently, but on their own merits, because there are common matters between them.
4. The submitted drawings do not accurately show the fenestration at the building as it currently appears. If works to the windows has taken place, then they are outside the scope of this appeal. I have confined my assessment to the kitchen extension proposed.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in these appeals is whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II curtilage listed building known as The Barn and the setting of the Grade II listed building known as Rutlands.

Reasons

6. The Barn is a curtilage listed structure through its association with Rutlands, a timber framed former farmhouse which probably has origins in the 17th Century. The Barn is likely an 18th Century agricultural structure with weatherboarded elevations and a pan tiled roof typical of the area. It has been extended over time, most notably by an unusually wide spanned gabled addition off the south eastern elevation. The conversion of the building to a dwelling has inescapably had an adverse impact on its significance as a former agricultural structure. Its original function, appearance and solidity has been altered or eroded. That said, a barn style has been retained and thus some evidential and historic value. There is also some surviving fabric and the large original door openings are marked by areas of glazing. The building therefore also has moderate architectural interest and value.
7. Historic mapping and an aerial photograph from around 1970 helpfully demonstrate the spatial and historical link between The Barn and Rutlands as part of an historic farmstead. This relationship is still discernible but is currently less clear due to the extensive boundary landscaping that has grown between the two buildings. The Barn now sits in its own residential curtilage rather than a farmyard and this includes several other domestic outbuildings, a tennis court and a swimming pool. The pool house is a recently approved contemporary flat roofed building. The setting of The Barn has therefore changed considerably in recent decades. Nevertheless, the building in its original siting still imparts some moderate historic and evidential value.
8. Accordingly, the significance of the listed building, in so far as it relates to these appeals, is primarily the architectural, evidential and historic value that can be gleaned from it as a vernacular style former barn. This significance is compounded by its association with a long-standing former farmstead, which included Rutlands as the farmhouse.
9. The Council have not raised concerns with the siting on principle of the proposed extension. Instead, its reservations relate to the design and form. The proposed extension would be a flat roofed addition and therefore it would not replicate the form of the historic barn or the historic agrarian setting. The appellants confirm that this was a deliberate aim of the design to ensure the new addition is overtly of its time. However, an extension to a listed building need not employ a contrasting style to be acceptable. In most instances it will be clear from the construction techniques used that an extension is new. Instead, it is more important for an extension to harmonise with a listed building and preserve its significance.
10. In this instance the flat roofed form of the extension would enable it to be tucked under the existing eaves. In this respect it would leave the existing roof uninterrupted and would appear subservient. The extension would be very small when compared to the massing of the barn and it would be discretely sited away from the most important north west facing elevation.

11. The extensive glazing would afford the extension a lightweight aesthetic that would allow the barn to remain legible behind. The building already has large areas of glazing and therefore the extension would not be out of character in this respect. Moreover, the black finish would integrate with that of the barn despite the material that is proposed to be used. As a result, the proposal would be a subtle addition that would harmonise with the barn and preserve its architectural value. It is also of note that no historic fabric would be affected or lost because of the scheme.
12. That said, the proposal would be a domestic styled extension to an historic barn and therefore I can understand the Council's reservations. Nevertheless, The Barn is much altered because the conversion was of its time and has resulted in a structure which has quite a domestic appearance. This is compounded by the accumulation of domestic paraphernalia in the curtilage, especially the new swimming pool and pool house next to the barn. The extension would respond to this character as well as the contemporary appearance of the pool house. Thus, the extension would not appear as an alien addition to the site.
13. For the foregoing reasons the proposal would not meaningfully harm the ability to experience the historic and evidential value of The Barn as a former agricultural structure or a surviving component of a historic farmstead. It also follows that the proposal would not harm the setting of Rutlands.
14. In conclusion, the proposal would preserve and thus not harm the significance and special interest of The Barn and Rutlands. Accordingly, the proposal would adhere to the expectations in Sections 66(1) and 16(1) of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 'Act'), Paragraphs 193 and 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') and Policies S7, GEN2, H8 and ENV2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2005 (LP) in so far as relevant, which seeks to secure proposals that are well designed and protect the special character of listed buildings.

Conditions

15. I have had regard to the advice in the Planning Practice Guide and the conditions suggested by the Council. It is necessary to impose a plans condition on Appeal A in the interests of certainty. There is no scope under s17 of the Act to do the same in respect of Appeal B. In the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the listed building it is necessary for details of external finishing materials to be approved.

Conclusions

16. For the reasons given the appeals are allowed.

Graham Chamberlain
INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

Appeal A

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The single storey extension hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 0076_EX01, 0076_EX02, 0076_EX20, 0076_EX21, 0076_EX22, 0076_PR20_I1, 0076_PR21_I1, 0076_PR22_I1, 0076_PR23_I1, 0076_PR24_I1, 0076_PR20_I1 and 0076_S02_I1.
- 3) No development beyond slab level shall take place until details of the following external finishes (including samples and/or photographs as appropriate) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
 - External walls
 - Roof
 - Windows
 - Doors

The development must be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Appeal B

- 1) The works hereby authorised shall commence not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
- 2) No works beyond slab level shall take place until details of the following external finishes (including samples and/or photographs as appropriate) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
 - External walls
 - Roof
 - Windows
 - Doors

The works must be carried out in accordance with the approved details.