

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2021

by Jo Dowling BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: Tuesday 23 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X0415/Y/21/3274872

Tudor Cottage, Village Road, Little Missenden HP7 0RD

- 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 Mrs Helen Graham against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref PL/20/2488/HB, dated 31 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2020.
 - The works proposed are add a small open porch to the main front door.
-

Decision

1. This appeal is dismissed.
2. Since the application was determined the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been updated. The Officers report, Council's appeal statement and decision made by the Council all refer to the provisions of the 2019 Framework. In considering this appeal I have considered it against the 2021 version of the Framework.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Missenden House is a double fronted Grade II listed Georgian manor house. The property has been extended and altered over time including a 19th Century two storey extension. In the 1950's the main house and several of the outbuildings were divided up into a number of separate residential units. One of these units is Tudor Cottage which is located to the east of the of the main house. Whilst physically attached to Missenden House internal access between the two properties is no longer possible.
5. From the information submitted with the appeal it would appear that Tudor Cottage was originally used as the servant quarters for the manor house. It consists of a number of elements. The main part of the cottage is one and a half storeys high with a clay tiled roof in which are located three dormer windows. To the front of this and linked by a partial cat slide roof is a single storey element which provides the sitting room, front hall and main access into the property. These single storey elements project forward of the main section of the cottage. Consequently, when viewed from the grounds and the road,

Tudor Cottage has the appearance of a collection of buildings which look to be ancillary to the manor house.

6. The proposed works would consist of the construction of an open sided porch over the existing front door. The porch would consist of an oak frame supporting a pitched roof with a half-timber gabled end. The roof would be covered in clay tiles to match the existing.
7. I agree that the design of the porch would not be out of character in this rural location and that porches of a similar design can be found on other properties of a similar age. Furthermore, I accept that it would reflect design elements found on the original cottage. However, in my opinion the historical significance of the buildings that make up Tudor Cottage is their ancillary relationship with and historic link to Missenden House. The introduction of a porch to the front of Tudor Cottage would formalise and increase the visibility of its front entrance. As a result, when viewed from the grounds or the road it would reinforce the appearance of this being a separate house rather than being an ancillary element of Missenden House. I therefore consider that the proposed porch would cause harm to the special interest of the listed building, albeit I acknowledge that this harm would be less than substantial.
8. I accept that the porch would afford some protection from the weather to the front of the building. However, such protection would be limited and would not provide sufficient public benefits to outweigh the harm to the special interest, or significance, of the listed buildings.
9. As a result, I consider that the works would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the building for which a clear and convincing justification has not been provided. The works would therefore not comply with the requirements of Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy LB1 of the Chiltern District Local Plan (1997) including alterations adopted May 2001 and the provisions of the Framework.

Other matters

10. I note the appellant considers that the Council did not positively engage with them in considering the application, including concerns that the Historic Buildings Officer did not undertake a site visit. However, I have limited information about the handling of the application by the Council and consequently I have determined the appeal on its merits and in light of my own site visit and the relevant planning policy.

Conclusion

11. Accordingly, for the reasons set out I conclude that the proposed porch would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of Tudor Cottage and Missenden House and as such the appeal should be dismissed.

Jo Dowling

INSPECTOR