
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 26 October 2021

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th October 2022

Appeal A: APP/N1730/W/20/3258981

Cold Piece Farm, Hound Green, Mattingley, Hook RG27 8LQ

- 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 Mrs V Perrins against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02817/HOU, dated 17 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is refurbishment of granary including replacement of existing metal roof with reclaimed tiles.
-

Appeal B: APP/N1730/Y/20/3258984

Cold Piece Farm, Hound Green, Mattingley, Hook RG27 8LQ

- 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 V Perrins against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02818/LBC, dated 17 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 July 2020.
 - The works proposed are refurbishment of granary including replacement of existing metal roof with reclaimed tiles.
-

Decision

Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for refurbishment of granary including replacement of existing metal roof with reclaimed tiles at Cold Piece Farm, Hound Green, Mattingley, Hook, RG27 8LQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/02817/HOU, dated 17 December 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: BHK_P_001_00, BHK_P_002_00, BHK_P_003_00, BKH14_P_019_P01; BKH14_P_081_RevP02, BKH14_P_211_RevP02, 19041-SFK-02-XX-DR-S-2001 P2, 19041-SFK-02-XX-DR-S-2101 P2, 19041-SFK-02-XX-DR-S-2201 P2, 19041-SFK-02-XX-DR-S-2201 P3, Granary Condition Survey Drawings, Granary Repair Drawings, and Philosophy for the Repair and Re-Use of the Historic Barns (Revised March 2020) only in so far as it relates to the Granary).

Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for refurbishment of granary including replacement of existing metal roof with reclaimed tiles at Cold Piece Farm, Hound Green, Mattingley, Hook, RG27 8LQ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 19/02818/LBC, dated 17 December 2019, the plans submitted with it and Drawing Nos BKH14_P_081_RevP02 and BKH14_P_211_RevP02 received with the appeal, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than three years from the date of this consent.

Procedural Matters

3. The appellant has submitted amended plans in support of the appeal (Drawing Nos BKH14_P_081_RevP02 and BKH14_P_211_RevP02), which did not form part of the original planning and listed building consent applications. These are submitted as the appellant no longer intends to provide a bat roost in the Granary, this is now proposed in the building known as 'the Potteries', which is situated some distance to the north of the Farmhouse. Having regard to the Wheatcroft principles (Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd v SSE), I am conscious that the appeal process should not be used as a means to progress alternatives to a scheme that has been refused. However, the Council has had opportunity to consider the plans as part of the appeal and no other interested parties made any comments in relation to the relevant matters on either of the original applications, so no one would be prejudiced if I were to consider the proposed amendments. My findings therefore relate to the amended plans listed above.
4. The appellant also provided a further structural report, which has been submitted to the Council in order to discharge planning conditions imposed for an alternative scheme at the Granary¹. It is unclear whether that approved scheme includes all the works included in the appeals and if the findings of the report have been accepted by the Council as part of that process. In any event, it was submitted at Final Comments stage, for which no further comments are invited. The Council has therefore not had opportunity to comment on the report for the appeals. I have therefore disregarded its content and my findings relate only to the evidence submitted with the applications in this respect.
5. The two appeals concern the same scheme under different, complementary legislation. I have therefore dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning.
6. The appeals are also related to three others at the same address² for which there are two further separate decisions. I am aware of the Unilateral Undertaking completed by the appellant in conjunction with one of these appeals, which includes reference to the appeals before me in this decision. This does not affect my consideration of these appeals in isolation.
7. The National Planning Policy Framework was revised on 20 July 2021 (the Framework). I have had regard to the Framework in my decision and I am satisfied that this has not prejudiced any party, particularly as the revisions do not alter the policies upon which this appeal turns.

¹ Planning Refs: 20/02933/HOU and 20/02934/LBC.

² Appeal Refs: APP/N1730/W/21/3279009, and APP/N1730/W/20/3258974 and APP/N1730/Y/20/3258976.

Main Issue

8. The main issue is whether the proposed works and development to the curtilage listed Granary building would preserve the Grade II listed building, known as 'Cold Piece Farmhouse', including any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

Significance

9. The Farmhouse is a Grade II listed building, positioned to the east of its historic farmyard, that is likely of early-18th Century origin, or possibly earlier. It has been subject of a series of later alterations, principally in extensions to the east and is now a relatively large house of two-storeys with attic rooms served by dormer windows. Despite this meaning that large parts of its fabric are more modern in origin, including the south façade facing farm buildings, these form part of the significance of the building, as they demonstrate how the building has evolved over time to meet the needs of its occupants. The architectural detailing is also noteworthy, particularly to its openings and roof.
10. In light of the above, as far as it is relevant to this appeal, the significance of the listed building is to be found in its architectural and historic interest, as a fine example of an early-18th Century, possibly earlier, Farmhouse with later additions.
11. The Farmhouse also includes the mid-to-late 18th Century Granary to its south. This did not appear on historic maps until 1875, so was likely constructed sometime between 1855 and that point. The Granary is a small square building of timber frame construction, including regularly spaced vertical studs and raking struts for bracing, beneath a pyramid roof and elevated on staddle stones. The walls are clad in modern, machine sawn, timber weatherboards and the roof covered with iron sheeting, both are visible internally. The timber framing and external cladding is exposed internally.
12. Given its age, and physical and functional relationship with the Farmhouse, the Granary is a curtilage listed building. Its simple architectural form is typical of its historic use for crop storage and helps to illustrate traditional joinery techniques from the period, which contributes to the significance of the listed Farmhouse.

Background and the Proposal

13. As outlined in Procedural Matters, the appellant no longer intends to utilise the Granary as a bat roost, rather it would be used for the storage of materials and gardening equipment. The works required for the former are therefore no longer included in the proposed refurbishment.
14. The alterations now proposed internally are to lift the historic tongue and groove floorboards, lay a new floor and lay the historic floorboards on top. While the appellant considers this a repair, the works are before me so I have taken them into account in my findings. Externally, the existing metal roof cladding and timber purlins and additional hip members, added to the roof structure to support that cladding, would be removed, and replaced with plain clay tiles. All four hip boards and missing, broken, or decaying common rafters

would be replaced on a like-for-like basis. Cast iron guttering is also proposed to be added to collect and discharge rainwater.

15. The existing timber weatherboarding and access steps will also be replaced with sawn timber clapboarding stained black to match the existing. The timber door and window hatch will be repaired. Beneath the Granary, the middle staddle stone on its south side is broken and there is a brick pier at the southeast corner, these would be replaced with new stone staddles.
16. Subject to further inspection of the central floor joist, when the floorboards are removed, additional support may be required alongside it. Localised repair may also be required of the studs and perimeter beams, as only a partial inspection was undertaken for the appeal documents.

Effect of the Proposal

17. The Council accepts that the Granary requires repair and describe this as timely and necessary given defects identified by the appellant. The Granary is no longer required for a bat roost, so it is proposed that it continues use as a garden tool and materials store. Internally, the contribution made to the character and appearance of the building by its exposed timber frame would therefore remain evident, as it would no longer be enclosed. Instead, it would be repaired, where necessary.
18. The lifting of the existing floor and its replacement would ensure safe access and use of the building. Along with the repair and replacement of external cladding, staddle stones and timber in the door, window hatch, and access steps, the reintroduction of existing floorboards above the new floor would ensure that historic fabric and features are retained. I note that the Council did not raise any objections to these elements of the proposal.
19. There is disagreement between the main parties as to whether the roof of the Granary was originally clad with corrugated metal or clay tiles. Based on the evidence before me, I consider that it is more likely to have been the latter, given that this more closely follows the design of remaining barns and those removed, as shown in the appellants Statement of Case. Moreover, as some of the common rafters are missing, the metal roof was probably added prior to or following the Second World War, in order to avoid repairing the tiled roof.
20. The Council does not have an 'in-principle objection' to the recladding of the roof with clay tiles, subject to details confirming that the building could structurally accommodate this change. The Structural Engineers Report³ submitted with the related applications suggests that, with the proposed repairs to the roof, the roof structure would be adequate for the loads expected with the proposed tiles. The Council has not provided any substantive evidence that would lead me to arrive at an alternative conclusion.
21. Despite the absence of loading calculations for the roof, based on the evidence before me, I have no reason to doubt the findings of the appellant's Structural Engineer or Historic Building Architect and consider the re-roofing proposed would not be harmful to the significance of the Granary as a curtilage listed building. Conversely, the appeal proposal would amount to a conservation-led approach to enhancing and securing the long-term future of the heritage asset.

³ Report No. 19041/R05, dated October 2019.

22. While the appellant has intimated that works to the Granary may not be undertaken due to the requirement for bat mitigation to be situated elsewhere, I have considered the appeal proposal in good faith. It would ultimately be for the Council to determine if any part of the proposal needed to be carried out urgently if works were not carried out in a timely manner. However, such matters may be dealt with through the abovementioned Unilateral Undertaking, were it to be actionable through the related appeal at this site.
23. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed works and development to the curtilage listed Granary would preserve the Grade II listed Farmhouse, including any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses. This would satisfy the requirements of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), paragraphs 197 and 199 of the Framework and would not conflict with the heritage aims of Policy NBE8 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032, Adopted April 2020.

Other Matters

24. The Granary is in relatively close proximity of the 'Barn at Cold Piece Farm to South of Farmhouse' and 'Cartshed at Cold Piece Farm', both of which are designated as Grade II listed buildings. I have therefore had regard to the statutory duty referred to in the Act. However, given that the works and development proposed to the Granary building would improve its appearance, the settings of these listed buildings would be enhanced by the proposal.

Conditions

25. In addition to the standard time limits for both appeals, in the interests of clarity I have specified the approved plans received with Appeal A, this is not necessary for Appeal B, as the decision incorporates the plans. However, I have not included the plans that refer to works associated with the original approach to provide a bat roost and which are not referred to on the amended plans received with the appeal⁴. Similarly, due to my findings above, and the omission of proposals for a bat roost, I have also not included the Council's suggested conditions regarding a structural report into the foundations and load bearing capacity of the roof of the building.

Conclusion

26. For the reasons given above, I conclude that both appeals should be allowed.

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR

⁴ Granary Repair Detailed Drawings series prepared by Giles Quarme Architects.