



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2025

by **O S Woodward MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 April 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/Y/24/3355876**

**Halesville Cottage, Gore Road, Ballards Gore, Rochford, Essex SS4 2DA**

- 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 Michael Simpson against the decision of Rochford District Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/00629/LBC.
  - The works proposed are to replace an existing dilapidated porch addition with new porch.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. Because the appeal relates to a refusal to grant listed building consent, I have had special regard to Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
3. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was released in December 2024 and further amended in February 2024. The changes were not material to the main issue for the appeal so I have therefore based my Decision on the revised document without needing to consult the main parties for comment.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether or not the proposal preserves the Grade II listed building 'Halesville Cottage'<sup>1</sup> or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

### Reasons

#### *Significance*

5. The building is a modestly sized late 18<sup>th</sup> Century cottage. It is timber framed and weatherboarded, with grey slate roofs. There are two main components to the building, the main 2-storey part and the 1-storey lean-to. The lean-to is a more modern addition and likely dates from the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century. However, they read as a coherent whole, with the weatherboarding unifying the appearance. The fenestration to the main body of the cottage, particularly to the front elevation, is well proportioned, and attractive. The quality of the fenestration, weatherboarding and slates, and the overall harmonious architectural language and appearance, all positively contribute towards the significance of the building.

---

<sup>1</sup> List entry number 1147518

6. There is also an existing porch providing the main front entrance. This is on the lean-to element of the building and is not original to the building. It is incongruously made of bricks with roof tiles, neither of which match the materials used to the main building. It is, however, relatively narrow and is set at a comfortable distance from the surrounding windows. Nevertheless, the inappropriate materials and prominence to the front elevation are both harmful to the significance of the building.

#### *Assessment*

7. Although the proposed demolition of the porch would result in the loss of historic fabric from the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century, this is not original, and is actively harmful to the significance of the building because of the incongruity with the main house. Its loss is therefore acceptable in-principle.
8. The proposed porch would be weatherboarded with a slate roof. These are materials that would match the main building and are supported in-principle. However, the porch would be larger than the existing, in particular it would be wider. This would mean it would unbalance the appearance of the front façade and would be disproportionately sized, even accounting for the unification in appearance through the proposed materials. It would also have an awkward relationship to the immediately adjacent window on the lean-to by being set too close. Lastly, the door is proposed in an off-centre location, creating an unbalanced appearance even within the porch itself.
9. The overall composition of the facade would remain in the sense that there would be a porch on the lean-to extension and with the roof being below the slope of the lean-to roof. However, this would not meaningfully lessen the visual impact of the proposed porch on the main part of the house caused by its overall bulk and mass. This is in a part of the front elevation particularly sensitive to change due to the proximity and slope of the lean-to's roof and the relatively small scale of this part of the building. That the porch would align with the western gable end of the main part of the house is a neutral factor which weighs neither for nor against the proposal.

#### *Overall*

10. Given the above, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II listed building, thus failing to satisfy the requirements of the Act, Paragraph 210 of the Framework and development plan policies insofar as relevant. The level of harm would be less than substantial.

#### **Heritage Balance**

11. In accordance with Paragraph 212 of the Framework, I place great weight on the conservation of designated heritage assets. Although less than substantial, I place considerable importance and weight on the harm that I have identified to the listed building. As set out at Paragraph 215 of the Framework, where there is less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
12. There would be very minor benefits to the economy from the construction of the porch. In addition, the slightly larger porch would provide more storage space for

shoes and coats. However, the existing hall provides potential for such storage. In addition, any benefit from a slightly wider access would be limited and could potentially be achieved in other ways. These are essentially private benefits of limited weight and the public benefits would be very limited. The harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset that I have identified clearly outweighs them.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons above, the appeal is dismissed.

*O S Woodward*  
INSPECTOR