



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 4 February 2025

by R Catchpole BSc (hons) PhD MCIEEM IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 February 2025

Appeal A: APP/A3010/W/24/3347811

Hall Farm, Main Street, Mattersey DN10 5DT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr William McIlroy against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application reference is 23/01386/HSE.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Appeal B: APP/A3010/Y/24/3347810

Hall Farm, Main Street, Mattersey DN10 5DT

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr William McIlroy against the decision of Bassetlaw District Council.
 - The application reference is 23/01387/LBA.
 - The works proposed are a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038 was adopted in May 2024, after the refusal of the proposal. I note that the decision notices do not apply the correct policy numbers as a result and that the policy context has since changed. As the appeals were made on 9 July 2024, I am satisfied that all parties have had an opportunity to address this change. I have relied upon the numbering for the historic environment policies, as set out in the adopted plan.
4. As the proposal is in a conservation area and relates to a listed building, I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act). Although the Council notes that the building is in a prominent location in the Mattersey Conservation Area (the CA) and within the setting of several other listed buildings, it has not identified any impacts in its Reason for Refusal. I observed that the proposal would have limited visibility from the public and private domains to the extent that it would not have an adverse effect on either the character or appearance of the CA, when

considered as a whole. Moreover, there would be no intervisibility with the nearby church or any other asset. As such, I am satisfied that no harm would result and the significance of these assets would be preserved.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building known as “Hall Farm” (Ref: 1273788) (the LB), and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

6. The LB dates from the early 19th century. It has a rectilinear, main range which fronts directly onto the walkway of Main Street. Two outriggers project from the rear elevation of the range. A Victorian, two storey extension is attached to one of these projections which has been raised in height to accommodate this later phase which appears as a continuation of this earlier, albeit altered, structure. The principal historic fabric is red brick and pantiles with a limited area of render on the south-western elevation. The simple architectural detailing speaks to its utilitarian role as a former farmhouse.
7. Given the above, I find that the special interest of the LB, insofar as it relates to these appeals, to be primarily associated with its simple architectural expression and use of traditional materials.
8. The proposed extension would be single storey and have a pitched, pantile roof that would surmount a heavy, timber-framed, glazed structure. It would extend across most of the gable end of the later Victorian addition. Access would be gained through a doorway that would be formed where there is presently an offset, modern sash window. The doorway would be a similar width to the existing window.
9. Whilst the proposal would be subservient, in terms of its height, it would nevertheless lead to an incongruent structure given the extent of its glazing and heavy timber frame. Whilst I note that similar materials have been used in the rear ‘walkway’ between the two outriggers, the proposed structure would be more prominent and visually distracting in terms of the cumulative impact of modern, incongruent materials on the building.
10. As the Council points out, it would be a suburban feature that would be wholly out of context with the surrounding locality which is not characterised by such structures. It would also obscure part of the gable end and lead to a loss of external historic fabric from the formation of the doorway. This would alter the internal circulation pattern and lead to the loss of a historic window opening. Taken together, these changes would also significantly erode the special interest of the building.
11. The appellant maintains that all of the sustainable development goals set out in paragraph 8 of the Framework would be met. However, this is not the case given the harm that would be caused to the LB which would be contrary to the environmental objective.
12. Given the above, the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building and I give this harm great weight in the planning balance of these appeals.

13. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should have a clear and convincing justification.
14. Given the scope of the proposal and its location, I find the harm to be less than substantial in this instance but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimal viable use.
15. The appellant is of the opinion that the proposal would be beneficial because of construction job creation, increased spending of more occupants, maintenance of local jobs and service provision as well as helping to meet future housing needs. I accept that these are public benefits but that they only carry negligible weight in favour of the proposal given its scale and the fact that a glass fronted reading room is unlikely to increase the occupancy level of the house.
16. I do not find that the public benefits are sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified in this instance. I also note that the continued viable use of the appeal property as a residential dwelling is not dependent on the proposal as the building has an ongoing residential use that would not cease in its absence.
17. Given the above and in the absence of public benefits that would outweigh the harm that would be caused, I conclude that, on balance, the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II listed building.
18. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 210(a) of the Framework and conflict with Policy 4 of the Mattersey Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2033 (2019) and Policies ST40 and ST41 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038 (2024).
19. These seek, among other things, to ensure that the effect of proposals on designated heritage assets are taken into account and that the historic environment and the significance of individual assets are conserved and enhanced. They also seek to ensure that development affecting such assets is sympathetic in terms of its siting, design, form, materials and detailing.

Conclusion

20. Given the above and considering all other matters raised, the appeals should be dismissed.

R Catchpole

INSPECTOR