



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 20 September 2022

by A Tucker BA (Hons) IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2022

Appeal A Ref: APP/T0355/W/21/3283434

Chalkpit Farm, Burchetts Green Road, Littlewick Green, Maidenhead, Berkshire, SL6 6RR

- 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 & Ms Jason and Kara Haigh-Ellery & Lane against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 21/01712, dated 27 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/T0355/Y/21/3283762

Chalkpit Farm Burchetts Green Road, Littlewick Green, Maidenhead, Berkshire, SL6 6RR

- 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 & Ms Jason and Kara Haigh-Ellery & Lane against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.
 - The application Ref 21/01816, dated 27 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2021.
 - The works proposed are single storey side extension.
-

Decision – Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Decision – Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeals relate to the same proposal under different legislation. Appeal A is made in respect of the planning application and Appeal B in respect of the listed building consent. I have considered each appeal on its own merits.
4. Since the Council issued its decisions the Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 (BLP) was adopted. The Council's statement brought this to the attention of the appellants. I am therefore satisfied that the parties are aware of this matter, and I will determine the appeals accordingly.

Main Issue

5. The main issue for both appeals is the effect of the proposal upon the character, appearance and special interest of the grade II listed building known as Barn at Chalkpit Farm.

Reasons

6. Section 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA) requires the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
7. The evidence before me gives the building a late 17th century date. It has a simple and functional appearance, with large openings. Despite its conversion to a dwelling it clearly presents itself as an historic agricultural building, in the context of other retained buildings to the southwest. Ventilation slits and a large gabled midstrete feature on its west elevation, and the whole building is dominated by a large clay tile covered roof with bonnet hips at each end. The historic scale of the building's interior can be appreciated from the entrance hall and significant internal roof timbers have been retained. The building's overall form, its functional agricultural appearance and setting as well as its surviving historic fabric are primary contributors to its special interest.
8. The extension would attach to the building's south elevation. It is understood that the existing opening here was inserted when the building was converted and that a building previously existed in this area. As a result, this is an aspect of the building that has the potential for further change without harming its special interest.
9. The proposed extension would occupy the full width of the building. It would have a non-traditional roof form with short pitched sections that would conceal a large flat roof. This arrangement would give the extension a bulky and squat form. It would fail to respond positively to the simple forms of the original building and in particular the prominent and vernacular appearance of the building's main roof.
10. The harmful form of the extension would be exacerbated by the use of part of the flat roof area as a balcony. The appearance of the railings and the potential for domestic paraphernalia such as garden furniture to be visible would reinforce the domestic appearance of the extension, which would be at odds with the agricultural and utilitarian appearance of the existing building.
11. The proposal would also see the existing south facing opening extended upwards. The head of the opening would be pointed. There is no justification before me to support this design approach, and it is contrary to the submitted heritage statement, which states that openings in traditional agricultural buildings are always rectangular. The proposed opening would be overly assertive and entirely at odds with the traditional and functional form of the building's other openings. It would also be difficult to detail successfully.
12. Furthermore, the enlarged opening would expose the existing timber frame to view from the outside. This would introduce a new aesthetic to the building that would be at odds with the traditional arrangement whereby the building's historic timbers are covered externally by its roof or masonry walls. It would also appear to be the case that the substantial horizontal beam would sit behind the head of the proposed first floor doors. Not only would this limit the functionality of the doors, this arrangement is also likely to appear rather clumsy and ill considered.

13. I accept that the impact of the proposal would largely be felt from within the building's curtilage, and to a lesser extent from the area to the west of the building. Both are areas with no public access. Substantial vegetation to the south and east means that there are no meaningful views of the area of the extension from the main road to the south. Whilst this would lessen the impact of the proposal on the wider character and appearance of the area, good conservation practice seeks to retain the integrity of historic assets whether they are publicly accessible or not. The lack of wider visibility does not therefore lessen the extent to which the proposal would harm the special interest of the building.
14. In terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) the harm would be less than substantial. Paragraph 202 of the Framework establishes that any harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. No public benefits are suggested by the appellants, and none are apparent based on my assessment of the proposal.
15. In summary, the proposal would fail to meet the requirements of the LBCA as it would harm the special interest of the building. It would also harm its character and appearance. It would be contrary to Policies HE1, QP1 and QP3 of the BLP, which together seek to ensure that development proposals conserve and enhance the historic environment, contribute positively to the place and are of a high quality of design.

Other Matters

16. The existing building is within the Green Belt. The Council suggests that the proposal would not be a disproportionate addition to the building, with reference to Paragraph 149 c) of the Framework. There is nothing before me that would cause me to come to a different view on this matter. I am thus satisfied that it should not become a main issue of the appeal.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons above, both appeals should be dismissed.

A Tucker

INSPECTOR