
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 17 May 2022

by Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th September 2022

Appeal A Ref: APP/J1915/W/21/3284616

Sprangewell Centre, Poles Lane, Thundridge, Hertfordshire, SG12 0SQ

- 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 Simon Constance against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref. 3/21/1364/HH, dated 20 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is removal of the existing flat roofed porch and replacement with an enclosed porch.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/J1915/Y/21/3283908

Sprangewell Centre, Poles Lane, Thundridge, Hertfordshire, SG12 0SQ

- 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 Simon Constance against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref. 3/21/1365/LBC, dated 20 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2021.
 - The works proposed are removal of the existing flat roofed porch and replacement with an enclosed porch; and internal alterations to remove an existing sliding door and frame and block up opening, insert new door and replace Acrow prop supporting steel beam in the cellar.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt but the Council concludes that the proposal would not constitute inappropriate development in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and has found no conflict with Green Belt policies within the development plan. I have no reason to disagree.
4. As the proposal relates to a listed building I have had special regard to section 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
5. During my site visit I noted that the internal sliding door to the kitchen had been removed, the opening blocked, and a new door installed as shown on the

proposed plans. Notwithstanding this, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the plans submitted.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building, Sprangewell Centre, Poles Lane, and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

7. Sprangewell Centre is listed at Grade II and forms the middle terrace of one of three dwellings within a large former house dating from the early C19 and incorporating a C17 building. The building is an impressive two storey white-painted brick building with pedimented stucco centre front framed by pilasters, topped by a large triangular pediment. It presents a high degree of symmetry despite its subdivision into three properties and some later alterations. All of this contributes to the building's significant architectural and historic interest.
8. There is an existing porch canopy over the door serving Sprangewell Centre that appears to be a relatively modern and rather crude addition to the building, with its plywood and felt roof construction. That said, its simple supports make it a lightweight structure that obscures the existing building only to a limited extent. Whilst its removal would be a heritage benefit, I am not persuaded by the brief Heritage Statement submitted that this would justify the proposed enclosed porch. The proposed porch would detract from the strong symmetry and balance of the existing building and highlight the multiple entrances now serving the building.
9. A similar porch to that being sought has been constructed at Sprangewell West, but that structure is less prominent when viewed from the public realm, and in any case does not justify further harm to the listed building.
10. The relocation of a doorway to the kitchen within a modern stud partition wall and replacement of relatively modern kitchen units would have a neutral effect on the listed building. The submitted plans are clear that these works would not affect historic fabric and I am therefore satisfied that sufficient information has been provided to assess the proposal. The existing Acrow prop in the cellar is showing signs of corrosion and its replacement with a more permanent solution would protect the longevity of the listed building.
11. Overall, the harm to the listed building would be less than substantial in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) but is nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. No public benefits have been identified that would outweigh this harm, notwithstanding that the existing insensitive porch would be removed and the replacement of an existing Acrow prop would be a beneficial measure in the long-term maintenance of the building.
12. The proposal would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 197 of the Framework and conflict with policies HA1 and HA7 of the East Herts District Plan 2018, which seek to conserve heritage assets. As a result, the proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

13. In light of the above, the appeals are dismissed.

Michael Boniface

INSPECTOR