



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 26 June 2025

by **Mark Philpott BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 July 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/N0410/Y/25/3359112

1 The Green, Seer Green Lane, Jordans, Buckinghamshire HP9 2ST

- 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 Dr Foot against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/24/1980/HB.
 - The works proposed are described as 'a single-storey rear extension in an 'Orangery' style. It would principally be constructed with brick masonry walls, with these being inset with painted timber framing and generous glazing in two elevations. There would also be a feature cornice detail and a flat roof with centrally positioned glazed lantern feature. A single-storey front infill extension is also proposed. It would be constructed of brickwork with a tiled lean-to hipped roof. This extension would be set back from both the front and side gable-end elevations in a subservient manner. It would be much smaller than the flat-roofed, single-storey, non-subservient front extension at neighbouring attached property no.2'.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/N0410/W/25/3359153

1 The Green, Seer Green Lane, Jordans, Buckinghamshire HP9 2ST

- 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 Dr Foot against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/24/1979/FA.
 - The development proposed is described as 'a single-storey rear extension in an 'Orangery' style. It would principally be constructed with brick masonry walls, with these being inset with painted timber framing and generous glazing in two elevations. There would also be a feature cornice detail and a flat roof with centrally positioned glazed lantern feature. A single-storey front infill extension is also proposed. It would be constructed of brickwork with a tiled lean-to hipped roof. This extension would be set back from both the front and side gable-end elevations in a subservient manner. It would be much smaller than the flat-roofed, single-storey, non-subservient front extension at neighbouring attached property no.2'.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A and Appeal B are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The site and the proposed works and development described above are taken from the application form. These are the same for both the listed building consent appeal (Appeal A) and the planning appeal (Appeal B). While the legal regimes for the appeals are different, I have dealt with them together to avoid repetition.
3. The scheme relates to 1 The Green which, along with the adjoining property at No 2, forms a single grade II listed building¹ in the Jordans Conservation Area (CA). Accordingly, in reaching my decisions, I have been mindful of my statutory duties

¹ List Entry Name: 1 and 2, The Green; List Entry Number: 1246114

in respect of sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

4. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was published after the Council made its decision. However, both main parties had an opportunity to comment on this during the appeals. Moreover, the differences between the current and prior versions of the Framework are negligible insofar as it is relevant. As such, I have not sought further views from the parties regarding this matter.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are whether the proposed works and development would preserve the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, and whether the character or appearance of the CA would be preserved or enhanced.

Reasons

6. The site is located within the village of Jordans. It is adjacent to the junction of Seer Green Lane and Beech Lane, with the listed building facing the village green. The statutory list description for Nos 1 and 2 sets out that construction of the village, as an ideal planned community for Quakers, began in 1919 to Fred Rowntree's designs of 1916. Among other things, it indicates that the listed building comprises a pair of former workers' cottages constructed in 1920, each with a projecting gabled facade, brick walls, tiled roofs and wooden, flush framed and multi-paned sash and casement windows. It further specifies that the cottages have group value with a range of other mostly unaltered and well-designed 'terraces' around the village green, which were purportedly the first built and intended for workers at Jordans Village Industries.
7. While the listed building's architectural features remain largely as described, the appellant and the Jordans Village Limited Estate Manager and Secretary have provided evidence which contradicts the listing in terms of the site's history. Principally, this includes records which indicate that the site was an undeveloped nursery plot in 1923 and subsequently leased to a person of means who later constructed and occupied one of the cottages, with the other occupied by a relative. On this basis, the cottages were not intended as workers' housing. In addition, the listing omits reference to alterations to the listed building, which include the replacement of some windows at No 1 and front, side and rear extensions to No 2. Furthermore, the cottages clearly do not form part of a terrace.
8. Nevertheless, the listed building's modest scale, surfacing materials and simple but distinctive and attractive design, especially its fenestration, reflect many of the other historic properties around the village green, particularly those that were workers' cottages. Accordingly, despite alterations and probable inaccuracies in the listing, Nos 1 and 2 and the workers' cottages are contemporaneous and together form an important part of the village's historic core. I therefore find that the special interest and significance of the listed building derives from its attributes and attractiveness in its own right, but also from its historic and architectural cohesiveness with much of the other housing around the village green.
9. The CA includes those properties around the village green and others nearby, Chalky Green to the south and the area around Old Jordans Farm, which is where the Quakers were first established. The CA designation statement makes clear

that its special interest and significance is informed by its historical associations with the Quaker movement and the readily identifiable planned built environment concentrated around the village green. Given the listed building's aforementioned special interest and significance, including its group value with other properties around the village green, it contributes positively to the historic core of the village and thus the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.

10. The proposed front extension would be attached to the outer side of the projecting gable to the façade of No 1. It would feature a monopitched roof and two small multi-paned windows. Additionally, seemingly historic casement windows in the front and side elevations of the gable would be removed, with the resulting openings blocked up and made into an internal doorway, respectively.
11. No 2's front extension is a large flat roofed addition that adjoins the front wall of its projecting gable and extends beyond its original side elevation. In contrast, the proposed front extension would be much smaller and comparatively subservient to the listed building. Nonetheless, it would be similar in width to and set back only slightly from No 1's projecting gable and, together with the front extension to No 2, disrupt the legibility of the original form of the listed building. This issue would be exacerbated by the proposed front window as, unlike the existing one, it would be misaligned with the window above it and be smaller than other front windows, with a notably lower head and fewer panes. No sense of symmetry would be achieved. Furthermore, while not identified by the Council, the removal of the existing windows would potentially result in the loss of features that contribute to the special interest and significance of the listed building.
12. The proposed rear extension would be 4.8 metres in length, around half the width of the cottage and sited near the shared boundary with No 2. It has been designed as an 'orangery' with features including a flat roof with a sizeable, glazed lantern, a high proportion of multi-paned windows and double doors, and cornice detailing. The proposal would not alter the existing rear fenestration, but enclose a seemingly historic sash window and an apparently newer set of doors by straddling the living room and the kitchen.
13. The extension's scale and orangery design would provide it with a sense of distinction and elevated style that would contrast poorly with the modest size and form of the listed building. This includes the proposed windows and doors, and each individual pane therein, which would appear oversized when compared to the proportions of the existing windows, particularly as the rear elevation currently has a consistent appearance, despite some windows being replacements.
14. The appellant argues that the orangery style of the extension would be in keeping with the site's origins as a nursery plot that was presumably once used for growing trees and plants for landscaping the village. However, this does not address the proposal's lack of coherence with the cottage as it currently stands, nor would further planting remedy the issues raised.
15. The rear extension differs considerably from the one at No 2, which does not have a comparable orangery design, and is located towards its outer edge such that it retains the openings in its rear elevation externally. Similarly, while I have been referred to alterations to properties elsewhere in the village, including The Cottage on Seer Green Lane, the original buildings, the plots on which they stand and the alterations to them are not directly comparable to the site and the proposed

scheme. Accordingly, the alterations to No 2 and elsewhere do not indicate that that the scheme's impacts are acceptable.

16. It has been put forward that the rear extension could potentially be removed in the future. However, it would clearly be attached to the listed building and details regarding how it may be removed without affecting existing fabric have not been provided. Furthermore, details have not been submitted as to when the extension may no longer be required, nor has a mechanism been proposed to secure its removal. Consequently, there is nothing before me which suggests that the harm caused would be temporary.
17. Overall, the proposed works and development would fail to preserve or enhance the special interest of the listed building, in conflict with sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Act. Its significance would therefore also be harmed. Additionally, though referenced in only one of the Council's delegated reports, the scheme would conflict with policy LB1 of the Chiltern District Local Plan (LP), which seeks to protect the special interest of listed buildings throughout the district. While the decision notices instead refer to LP policy LB2, this relates to the setting of rather than direct impacts to listed buildings, and so is not directly relevant to the issues identified.
18. In respect of the CA specifically, the front and rear extensions would be screened to an extent by boundary vegetation. However, I cannot be sure that this would endure indefinitely and, in any case, the upper parts of the rear extension would be visible from Beech Lane. This would detract from and contrast with the simple yet distinctive visible parts of the rear elevation and thereby somewhat diminish the listing building's contribution to the CA.
19. Consequently, there would be some small residual harm to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole, in conflict with section 72(1) of the Act. Its significance would therefore also be harmed. In this way the proposal conflicts with LP policies CA1 and CA2, which specify that schemes will not be permitted where the character of appearance of, or important views from within, looking out from or into, conservation areas would not be preserved or enhanced.
20. Paragraph 212 of the Framework advises that when considering the impacts to the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Having regard to the scale and nature of the scheme, the harm to the listed building and the CA would be less than substantial in the terms of the Framework. Paragraph 215 of the Framework explains that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme including, where appropriate, securing the asset's optimum viable use.
21. The scheme is designed to improve the applicant's quality of life by providing a ground floor washroom and dining room that could be adapted to meet their potential future needs for daily living. It is also put forward that the dining room would facilitate family and communal living in alignment with Fred Rowntree's original vision and designs. While the benefits associated with these rooms would accrue privately rather than publicly, I have given them careful consideration. However, though a few alternate adaptation options have been assessed, some have been discounted for personal preference reasons rather than for logistical or technical ones, such as because of a preferred use of a side entrance. In any case, compelling evidence has not been presented which indicates that no other

options would be less harmful to the heritage assets. Moreover, while it is understandable that the appellant wants to washroom facilities to address potential needs in the future, I can see no clear current or future need for an extension to provide a dining room. The aggregate public benefits are therefore limited.

22. In contrast, even the less than substantial harm to the listed building and the CA as designated heritage assets must carry great weight. Taken together, the public benefits are insufficient to outweigh the harm to the listed building and the CA. The scheme therefore conflicts with the Framework.

Other Matters

23. The scheme has been approved by Jordans Village Limited, which has its own management scheme, planning policies and rules for alterations to properties in the village. However, that approval process is entirely separate to the processes set out in planning legislation and policy. Consequently, it has no bearing on the outcome of the appeals.
24. The site is located in the Green Belt. Based on a map of the CA, it may also be within a National Landscape. The main parties have not provided much detail in respect of either of these matters but given my findings in respect of the substantive issues in dispute, it is not necessary for me to consider them further.

Conclusions

25. The conflicts with the Act and the Framework are determinative for Appeal A.
26. In respect of Appeal B, the proposal is contrary to the development plan taken as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be reached otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
27. For the reasons given above, both appeals should be dismissed.

Mark Philpott

INSPECTOR