



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2022

by Mr Cullum Parker BA(Hons) PGCert MA MRTPI MCMI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V3120/Y/22/3301497

Chandlers, Halls Lane, East Hanney, Wantage OX12 0HJ

- 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 Timothy Messer against the decision of Vale of White Horse District Council.
 - The application Ref P21/V2891/LB, dated 6 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2021.
 - The works proposed are described as *Repair and conservation of a 17th Century thatched, oak framed barn. This application pertains only to remedial works to the frame and cladding. Listed Building Consent has been granted for the conversion under application number P17/V2025/LB on the 25th October 2017. The extent of the works is detailed in the appended document entitled "Schedule of Suggested Remedial Works to the Timber Frame of Chandlers Barn". Planning permission was granted on the 25th October 2017 under P17/V2024/FUL'.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. In 2017 planning permission was granted for a number of works to the appeal building (principally an oak framed barn). It is understood that most of these have been started/implemented. However, there is single storey pitched roof element attached to the barn which has been converted to a car port structure. The pitched roof was formerly a clay tile roof. These were in a state of disrepair, and the Appellant replaced them with dark grey concrete tiles. This appeal seeks listed building consent for these concrete tiles, as shown on the submitted drawings.
3. The main issue, therefore, is whether the works relating to the re-roofing of the single storey part of the listed building would preserve the special architectural or historical interest of the listed building.

Reasons

4. The property, a thatched roofed, timber framed grade II listed barn, is located towards the north of East Hanney within a Conservation Area. The barn is orientated east / west parallel to Halls Lane with neighbouring properties located to the north, east and west of the site. The nearby buildings are characterised by the use of brick or render walls with either clay tile or thatched roofs. Where concrete tiles are used, these are typically found on buildings dating from the second half of the C20th.

5. Visually, the use of grey for the concrete tiles helps reduce their visual impact. However, they contrast sharply with both the thatched finish on the main part of the listed building and the plain clay tiles found more generally in the locality. I note the suggestion that tiles were used in order to enable fire access from the main building out onto the car port roof. Clearly this is a sensible solution compared to the use of thatch.
6. However, the use of concrete tiles is distinctly contrasting as a modern appearing material. The use of a plain clay roofing material would not only enable egress from the building in the event of a fire, but would also be consistent with the original roofing material found at this part of the listed building. It would also be consistent with the rural vernacular found in this settlement, whereas the grey concrete tiles introduce a distinctly modern addition to the listed building. The result is that the special architectural and historic features of the listed building would not be preserved; special regard to which is sought by s16(2) of the *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990*, as amended.
7. I note that this material has been used in order to ensure safe exit from the building in the event of fire for example. However, there are other materials which might be used which could achieve the same outcome but in a historically sympathetic way. The public benefits in terms of fire safety do not outweigh the less than substantial harm in this case.
8. I therefore find that the works do not preserve the architectural and historic interest of the listed building. The works do not, therefore, accord with the aims of policies CP37 and CP39 of the Local Plan Part 1 or policies DP36 and DP38 of the Local Plan Part 2 which seek such aims.
9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

C Parker

INSPECTOR