



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: 3 August 2021

Appeal A - Ref: APP/ H1515/W/20/3246561

Woodbarns Farm, Blackmore Road, Fryerning, Essex CM4 0PA

- 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 and Mrs Bailey against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01324/FUL, dated 22 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'retention of existing conservatory'.
-

Appeal B - Ref: APP/H1515/Y/20/3246560

Woodbarns Farm, Blackmore Road, Fryerning, Essex CM4 0PA

- 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 Bailey against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01325/LBC, dated 22 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2019.
 - The works proposed are described as 'retention of existing conservatory'.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A - The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the retention of a conservatory at Woodbarns Farm, Blackmore Road, Fryerning, Essex CM4 0PA, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 19/01324/FUL, dated 22 September 2019, subject to the following condition.

1) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the following approved drawings: Location Plan at a scale of 1:2500 and plans 19/09/001, 19/09/002, 19/09/003, 19/09/004 and 19/09/005.
2. Appeal B - The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for the retention of a conservatory at Woodbarns Farm, Blackmore Road, Fryerning, Essex CM4 0PA in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 19/01325/LBC dated 22 September 2019.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have considered the two appeals concurrently, but on their own merits, because there are common matters between them. I observed that the development and works have taken place.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in these appeals is whether the proposed works and development would preserve the Grade II listed building known as Woodbarns Farm.

Reasons

5. Woodbarns Farm is a former farmhouse with a central core that probably dates to the 16th or early 17th Century. This part of the building is timber framed and largely rendered although a brick façade was added to the principal elevation as a means of overt gentrification. The phasing plan submitted by the appellants indicates that the early modern core of the building has been progressively altered by several accretions added in the 19th, 20th and 21st Centuries. The additions have generally been subservient, leaving the older part of the building legible and preminent. This results in interesting layering and means the building is not an unaltered survivor of the early modern era or the product of a single period or overarching design concept.
6. Historic mapping demonstrates that by 1874 Woodbarns Farm was a large property with an extensive range of barns to the rear. There were large grounds and perhaps a pleasure garden to the front that may be contemporary with the high-status façade. This all suggests that by the mid to late 19th Century the building was a grand country residence. This impression has endured despite the amendments through the 20th and 21st Centuries, which included subdivision into two dwellings, extensions, separation from the barns and then its reinstatement and renovation as a single dwelling. As a result, the building does not glean significance from being humble or small.
7. The age of the building gives it historic value. There is evidential value in the construction techniques on show, especially the timber frame as a surviving record of the vernacular. The evolution of the building into a grand country residence and its former role as part of a historic farmstead also provide evidential value. The building's attractive appearance and situation in its surrounding grounds and the wider landscape provides aesthetic value. Accordingly, the significance of the listed building, in so far as it relates to these appeals, is found in these historic, evidential, and aesthetic values.
8. The proposed extension does not replicate an early modern vernacular style, but this is unsurprising because the building encompasses several layers spanning 400 years and therefore a single architectural period does not endure. That said, it is traditional in design with balanced elevations, timber painted joinery and a handmade brick plinth that matches the modern extension it adjoins. As a result, it is modern but harmonious. A garden room extension is not out of place on a dwelling of this scale and fits the narrative and character of a grand country residence. It interacts pleasantly with the grounds and is subserviently placed off a modern extension and within the walled garden. The consequence being that the proposal does not offend the aesthetic value of the listed building and is sympathetic to its character.
9. The addition elongates the plan of Woodbarns Farm and alters the balance between the historic fabric and floor plan and newer additions. However, it is away from the early modern core and has not resulted in the loss of any historic fabric. Furthermore, it is of a modest scale when viewed relative to the structure as a whole and therefore respects the hierarchy of decreasing scales

and forms away from the oldest part of the building. Thus, the 16/17th Century core is still the main part of the building despite all the additions, including the appeal scheme. The appeal scheme does not individually or cumulatively overpower the scale, massing or plan of the more historic elements of the building. On the contrary, the proposal is a proportionate addition. Accordingly, the extension does not harmfully disrupt how the building is understood or appreciated as an evolved early modern farmhouse and therefore the historic and evidential value of the building would not be harmed.

10. In conclusion, the development and works preserve the listed building. Its significance and special interest has not been harmed. This adheres to the expectations of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 'Act'). The proposal also adheres to Policies CP1 and C15 of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005 insofar as relevant, which only permits alterations and extensions to listed buildings if they would not detract from its character and are sympathetic. There is nothing of substance before me to suggest the emerging Local Development Plan will take a different approach.

Conditions

11. As the development and works have taken place there is no need for commencement conditions. 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.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given the appeals are allowed.

Graham Chamberlain
INSPECTOR