



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 28 February 2022

by Mike Hayden BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 MARCH 2022

Appeal A: Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/Y/21/3277242

Stackyards, Rands Road, High Roding, Essex CM6 1NQ

- 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 Daniel Roberts against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/21/0891/LB, dated 8 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2021.
 - The works proposed are single storey rear extension.
-

Appeal B: Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/D/21/3277243

Stackyards, Rands Road, High Roding, Essex CM6 1NQ

- 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 Daniel Roberts against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/21/0890/HHF, dated 8 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. *Appeal A*: The appeal is dismissed.
2. *Appeal B*: The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in these appeals is the effect of the proposed extension on the special architectural and historic interest of Stackyards and on the setting of Attridges Farmhouse, as a Grade II listed buildings.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, known as Stackyards, is addressed in the statutory list as '*Barn approximately 20 metres north west of Attridges Farmhouse*'¹. It is a Grade II listed, timber framed and weatherboarded, former barn, dating from the C18. Attridges Farmhouse is a Grade II listed house, dating to the C16.
5. Although the two are now separate properties, historical mapping shows that Stackyards originally formed part of Attridges Farm. It was one of a range of farm buildings, which were laid out in a typical C-shaped format around an enclosed farmyard that faced towards Attridges Farmhouse. Stackyards

¹ List entry 1141273, National Heritage List for England, Historic England

appears to have been the principal barn, forming the rearmost enclosure on the south-western boundary of the farmyard, with the remaining farm buildings ranged to the north closer to the road. This arrangement remained until at least the middle of the C20, with little else around the farm other than fields and open countryside.

6. The setting of both Stackyards and Attridges Farmhouse has changed considerably since then. The other buildings which formed the enclosed farmyard to the north of Stackyards, have been demolished, and a series of larger, more modern agricultural buildings erected to the rear and south of Stackyards and Attridges Farmhouse, housing an equestrian centre and cattery. A paved and gravelled courtyard garden and an annexe outbuilding to the immediate rear of Stackyards separate it from the equestrian centre, and a fence and hedge along its south-eastern boundary separate it from Attridges Farmhouse.
7. Stackyards was converted to residential use in 2001/2. The appellant advises that it was heavily damaged by a fire in 2010, which destroyed much of the roof structure. However, the listed building has been repaired and restored, so that in terms of its external appearance it replicates the form and architecture of the original building, including its stepped, tiled roof and black stained weatherboarding. The gabled midstrey to the rear also remains, containing the original barn opening to the fields, which is now infilled with glazing. Single storey, lean-two extensions either side of the midstrey are more modern infills, but have been designed to be subservient to the historic barn structure and finished in traditional materials to match the rest of building.
8. Notwithstanding the changes to the setting of Stackyards and the effects of the fire on its historic fabric, to date its special historic and architectural interest has been largely preserved. It remains of heritage significance as an example of the functional design and aesthetics of a traditional farm building in this part of Essex, and as a remnant of the original farmyard associated with Attridges Farm.
9. The appeal scheme proposes an 18 metre (m) long by 6m wide, single storey extension, projecting from the rear elevation of Stackyards, at the eastern end of the building, along the boundary with Attridges Farmhouse. Its ridge height would be the same as that of the rear projecting midstrey and the existing annexe outbuilding. The plans show that it has been designed to appear as a standalone, converted former farm building. It would be connected to Stackyards by a glazed link to create visual separation from the existing building, and the elevation facing into the courtyard is designed with sliding timber, barn style doors to the openings. Weatherboarding and a tiled roof are proposed to match the existing materials.
10. I recognise that the design is intended to reduce the visual impact of the extension and respond to the traditional form and architecture of Stackyards. However, in my view it would still fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building, in the following ways.
11. Whilst the length and height of the extension would be comparable to those of the existing outbuilding, it is evident from the plans that its greater width would result in a bulkier form, with a shallower roof pitch and a broader profile to its gable ends. Moreover, as an extension to Stackyards, notwithstanding the glazed link, it's dimensions would be read in relation to those of the listed

- building. The bulkier proportions of the extension would be dissonant with the more slender width and gable profiles of the two-storey section and midstretey of Stackyards, which reflect its vernacular architecture and historic function as a former barn. Although subservient in height to the main two-storey section of Stackyards, the combined height and length of the extension would visually compete with and detract from the modest scale of the midstretey, as a feature of special architectural and historic interest to the listed building.
12. On this basis, I consider that the proposed extension would be a discordant and disproportionate addition to the listed building. As such, it would fail to comply with Policies H8 and ENV2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (2005) (the ULP), which, respectively, require extensions to respect the scale and design of the original building, and that alterations which impair the special characteristics of a listed building should not be permitted.
 13. I recognise that the extension would be within the private, rear courtyard of the property, and largely screened from public viewpoints by the mature hedges along Rands Road and the public footpath to the west. However, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest, irrespective of whether or not public views can be gained.
 14. With regard to the effect of the proposed development on the setting of Attridges Farmhouse, it would be visible from the access between the two properties, but seen in the context of the variety of other stables, barns and structures, which are clustered to the rear of the Farmhouse. As such, it would have a largely neutral effect on the setting of Attridges Farmhouse as a listed building.
 15. Nevertheless, for the reasons set out above, I find that the proposed extension would cause harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building at Stackyards and its heritage significance as a former agricultural barn associated with Attridges Farmhouse. In terms of the scales of harm identified in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I consider that the harm caused to the significance of the heritage asset would be less than substantial, but that is not to say that the harm is not significant.
 16. Paragraph 202 of the Framework requires that less than substantial harm to a heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In terms of the weight to be attached to the harm, paragraph 199 of the Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of whether the harm amounts to substantial or less than substantial harm. In light of this and the statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, I give considerable weight to the harm the proposed works would cause to its heritage significance.
 17. With regard to public benefits, the Planning Practice Guidance² (PPG) states that they should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and not just be a private benefit, but that works to a listed private dwelling which secure its future as a designated heritage asset would be a public benefit. The appellant states that the proposed extension would provide

² PPG Paragraph: 020 Reference ID: 18a-020-20190723

additional living accommodation, but there is little evidence before me to demonstrate what extra facilities would be provided or that the existing accommodation is inadequate.

18. I have considered whether the positioning of the proposed extension to recreate the C-shaped layout of the former farmyard would offer any heritage benefit to outweigh the harm. However, historically the farmyard and associated barns were to the north of Stackyards, with the buildings orientated towards Attridges Farmhouse. The proposed extension would result in a courtyard that would turn its back on Attridges Farmhouse. As such, I am not persuaded that the proposal would add any heritage value in this regard.
19. Therefore, I conclude that there would be insufficient public benefit to outweigh the identified harm or the special regard to be had to the preservation of the listed building under the Act. The proposed works and development would also fail to comply with Policies H8 and ENV2 of the ULP.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

M Hayden

INSPECTOR