



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 10 January 2022

by Patrick Whelan BA(Hons) Dip Arch MA MSc ARB RIBA RTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 January 2022

Appeal A Ref: APP/M2270/W/21/3267346

Marlingate Granary, Bedgebury Road, Goudhurst, Cranbrook TN17 2QY

- 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 Lee Fletcher against the decision of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02629/FULL, dated 12 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/M2270/Y/21/3267344

Marlingate Granary, Bedgebury Road, Goudhurst, Cranbrook TN17 2QY

- 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 Lee Fletcher against the decision of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02630/LBC, dated 12 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2020.
 - The works proposed are a single storey rear extension.
-

Decisions

Appeal A Ref: APP/M2270/W/21/3267346

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension, at Marlingate Granary, Bedgebury Road, Goudhurst, Cranbrook TN17 2QY, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/02629/FULL, dated 12 September 2020, subject to the conditions in the schedule at the end of this decision.

Appeal B Ref: APP/M2270/Y/21/3267344

2. The appeal is allowed, and listed building consent is granted for a single storey rear extension, at Marlingate Granary, Bedgebury Road, Goudhurst, Cranbrook TN17 2QY, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/02630/LBC, dated 12 September 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the schedule at the end of this decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. As the proposal relates to a listed building, I have had special regard to sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act). As set out above, there are two appeals on this
-

site. To avoid duplication, I have dealt with the two appeals together, except where otherwise indicated.

Main Issues

4. The main issue in both appeals is whether the proposal would preserve the grade II listed building whose statutory address is Granary about 30 metres west of Little Marlingate, Bedgebury Road, and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

The significance of the listed building

5. As a turn of the C19 building once used for the dry and secure storage of grain after it has been threshed and winnowed, the size of the granary indicates the arable acreage, and its proximity to the farmhouse and oast, its utility to the farm in the setting of whose fields it stands. The 1909 map indicates a building of larger footprint adjoining its north flank, in the field, springing from the field boundary.
6. The building has historic significance too in its typology, particularly its compact footprint, upper floor and the external route to access it. There appears to be reused timber in the roof structure, and traces of openings for what may have been vents at ground level. The external walls, which incorporate simple, arch lintels over openings, appear to have been built in Flemish bond brickwork, their lower sections, as distinct from the plainer, and less regular upper sections, with great precision, using burnt headers as decoration between deep, red stretchers, with neat bonding around openings. This architectural ambition suggests that, alongside the utility of its agricultural function, whoever first built this granary, intended it to catch the eye.

The effect of the proposal on the listed building

7. Extension: I understand the Council's concerns about the effect on the significance of the building from an insensitively sized extension sited too close to it, risking its domination, with the consequential degradation of its historic interest and architectural character as a free-standing, compact building of modest footprint. However, the magnitude of the footprint and the height of the extension would be modest relative to the existing building, to which its scale would defer.
8. The proportions of the extension, its mono-pitch roof form which would be set as low as it dares to maintain access, together with the use of sensitive but non-clay materials, would avoid a mini-granary replication or arbitrary, pseudo-vernacular implant. This design approach would preserve the architectural primacy of the existing building and distinguish its hipped roof form, its functional proportions, its traditional materials and the historic interest of its form and appearance.
9. The footprint of the extension would be smaller than the footprint of the existing building, and substantially less than the proposal dismissed at appeal¹

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/M2270/W/18/3215672 & APP/M2270/Y/18/3215761

in 2019. Unlike that design, which was found to be out of balance with the granary and set too close for its width, the footprint and width of this iteration would remain within its shadow. The extension would be set-off from the listed building a sufficient distance to avoid it overwhelming the listed building, the order and texture of whose elevation would continue to be legible. Sufficient space would be retained around the building and its extension to maintain its open, rural setting.

10. Link: The link between the building and the extension would be formed in frameless glass, the transparent and reflective nature of which would differentiate the connection between the existing building and its extension.
11. The simple, arched form over the opening, the present width of the opening, and particularly the brick dressing around it could be retained, and this could be secured by condition. So too with what appear to be vents to each side of the line of the proposed glazed link around which the brickwork has been carefully bonded. A condition could prevent the bonding pattern around them from being lost during construction. Conditions could also secure the sensitivity of the fabric connection between the frameless glass link and the wall of the granary to minimise the impact on the facework of the building.
12. Alteration work: There would be some loss of historic fabric from the removal of the section of wall below the existing opening to allow passage into the proposed extension. However, given how the walls of the building already exhibit more than one phase of development and adaptation, the limited amount of material which would be removed, and the remaining fabric of similar age, the loss of fabric would not harm the special architectural or historic interest of the building, which has been listed for its group value.
13. Materials and detailing: The corrugated form of the roof and wall finishes shown on the drawings would reflect the texture of the walls of the listed building and the familiar, utilitarian character of modern agricultural buildings, distinguishing the new work from the old. Materials and detailing could be conditioned to ensure the architectural integrity of the design at planning stage is continued into construction.
14. The listed farmhouses Marlingate and Little Marlingate are a substantial distance from the proposal and separated from it by structures and planting. Their settings would not be affected, and therefore preserved.

Conclusion

15. I conclude that the form, scale, and materials of the extension and its delicate link would have a lightness and a charm, eschewing domesticity and pastiche, instead making a proposal that contrasts sensitively with the existing building while reflecting its agricultural origins and its landscape setting.
16. It would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the grade II listed building. It would satisfy the requirements of the Act, as well as paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework. There would be no conflict with Core Policy 4 of the Core Strategy 2010 which seeks to conserve and enhance the borough's heritage assets and to give special regard to their

settings. Nor would it be at odds with policies EN1 and H11 of the Local Plan 2006 which require development to respect the context of the site and for extensions to buildings outside the limits to built development to be modest and in scale with the original building, not to dominate it visually or to result in a poorly proportioned building, or to detract from its character or setting.

17. For the reasons above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeals should be allowed.

Conditions

18. The Council has suggested a plans reference condition, which is necessary in the interests of proper planning, in the planning permission. In the listed building consent, it is essential that any new foundations and drainage do not undermine the existing building, so I have applied a condition [2] for their details.
19. It is necessary to have clarity on the materials and finishes for the new walls and roof, so I have applied a condition [3] requiring a schedule and samples. It is equally important that the final detailing and arrangement of the new work lives up to the design as proposed at planning stage. Hence, I have applied a condition [4] requiring drawn details of the new components and their junctions in the new work, as well as a condition [5] to protect the features of special interest I have identified from their interface with the new work.
20. While these conditions do not need to be resolved before commencement, the matters they control should be settled before the extension and link rise out of the ground because of implications for programming and weathertightness. I have also applied a performance condition [6] to secure the existing brick bonding around vent openings and the external reveals and arch through to the extension as these are features of special interest.

Patrick Whelan

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions

Appeal A Ref: APP/M2270/W/21/3267346

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings:

20_186-05	Location Plan & Existing Site Block Plan
20_186-10	Existing Plans & Elevations
20_186_30	Proposed Site Block & Floor Plan
20_186-40	Proposed Elevations (Sheet 1 of 2)
20_186-41	Proposed Elevations (Sheet 2 of 2)

Appeal B Ref: APP/M2270/Y/21/3267344

- 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
- 2) Foundations and drainage: Before ground works for foundations under the new building are begun, details of the foundations of the existing and proposed buildings and the location, routes and means of disposal of surface water shall have been submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing.
- 3) Schedule of materials: Before any works above ground level are begun, a detailed schedule and samples of the materials and finishes to be used for the external walls and roof of the extension shall have been submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule.
- 4) New work: Before any new works above ground level are begun, fully detailed drawings of the following key components, as well as their junctions with adjoining new work shall have been submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing:-
 - a) The frameless glass link, and its interface with the extension
 - b) The metal framed windows and their interface with the extension
 - c) The routing of services into the extension
 - d) Any externally fixed rainwater disposal fittings above groundThe works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings.
- 5) Interface existing/new work: Before any works above ground level are begun, fully detailed drawings of the interface of new work with the existing building shall have been submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing, and shall include:-
 - a) Any measures for differential movement between the existing and new structures
 - b) The position of the frameless glass link walls and roof in relation to the low-level vent openings beside the opening and the arch above it in the existing building
 - c) The frameless glass link connection to the existing wall, and any flashings, weatherproofing, and means of support
 - d) The treatment of the jambs of the existing opening the cill of which is to be dropped, and the retention of the external brick bond around itThe works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings.

- 6) Preserving bonding: The brickwork around what appear as the two low-level vent openings beside the existing opening the cill of which is to be dropped, as well as the brickwork forming its external reveals and the brickwork forming its external arch above shall be retained unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

END OF SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS