
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 9 September 2025

by **R Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/W0530/W/25/3366547

15 North End, Bassingbourn, Royston SG8 5NX

- 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 David Bartlett against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref: is 25/00148/HFUL.
 - The development proposed is single storey side and rear extension with roof lantern, new sliding door to rear, ground floor internal alterations to create new study and utility and existing chimney to be increased in height.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/W0530/Y/25/3366472

15 North End, Bassingbourn, Royston SG8 5NX

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Bartlett against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref: is 25/00149/LBC.
 - The development proposed is single storey side and rear extension with roof lantern, new sliding door to rear, ground floor internal alterations to create new study and utility and existing chimney to be increased in height.
-

Decisions

Appeal A Ref: APP/W0530/W/25/3366547

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B Ref: APP/W0530/Y/25/3366472

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

3. As the proposal relates to a listed building in a conservation area, I have had special regard and paid special attention to the requirements of sections 16(2) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) in my determination of the appeals.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are whether the proposal preserves 15 North End, a Grade II listed building and any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses and whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Bassingbourn Conservation Area (the BCA).

Reasons

The listed building

5. The appeal property is a Grade II listed¹ c.15th century building with 17th and 19th century additions and alterations including subdivision into agricultural workers cottages in the 19th century. It is currently in use as a single residential dwelling. Constructed from a timber frame with exposed plaster and under a steeply thatched roof with a red brick ridge stack and end stack on the western elevation the property has also benefitted from a single storey mid-20th century extension on the west end also under a pitched roof.
6. Two storeys, the building has a prominent timber framed gable facing the street and a timber framed back-to-back chimney, with a late 17th century extension to the east gable and a 19th century stack added to the west. It has a glazed entrance door, with a modern entrance in the north elevation, with four ground floor 16 paned sash hung windows and four first floor casement windows. Internally it contains an exposed timber framing with two four centred arched door heads with a rare, exposed chimney frame.
7. The special interest of the listed building is therefore primarily associated with the surviving historic fabric and its architectural and aesthetic value. It is an attractive repository and expression of past building and working traditions and technologies demonstrating the skills of the craftsmen of the time with a valuable aesthetic quality within a retained village setting. It also has historic cultural significance relating to the evolution of rural built form and local vernacular artisanry which positively contributes to an understanding of how such buildings have evolved over time.
8. The Council do not object in principle to the form of the single storey rear extension, the chimney (subject to details) or the proposed internal alterations and on my reading the dispute relates solely to the associated changes to the fenestration. With regards to the chimney the increase in height above the thatched ridge would be visible on the approach from the north albeit screened in some views by landscaping at street level. Its alteration is required for fire safety reasons and would enable full use of the original fireplace. Subject to agreement on the details of the amount of brick coursing and proportions of the chimney pot the alterations would be of a minor scale, would not be an overly prominent or out of keeping to the extent that it would harm the buildings special historic interest and significance.
9. The kitchen alterations could be carried out without harming historic fabric and the works would not disrupt the legibility of the internal layout as the kitchen is not in its original position. All service runs, drains and pipes are in place and all partitions connected to modern fabric could be removed in future. Existing openings would also remain unaltered and overall, I have no reasons to disagree with the Council's assessment, supported by their specialist conservation officer's advice.
10. Turning to the fenestration the proposed window to the ground floor side elevation would be seen in association with, and out of keeping, with what appeared to be white painted timber framed windows with lead detailing and not the style of

¹ Listing Entry: 1330837.

window shown on drawing ref: BASS/CB/24/02. At the rear whilst the ground floor doorway could be extended to reflect a former opening, such large areas of glazing contained within a single aluminium frame with sliding doors and without respectful detailing would be out of keeping with the appearance and architectural interest of the building's existing fenestration.

11. Given the rather attractive and consistent language of the fenestration throughout the building including traditional wall to fenestration proportions still evident, reflecting former costs associated with glazing and a more functional use, the extent of glazing proposed would appear disproportionate and excessive. There would also be a visually awkward juxtaposition of the large panes of glass, the top of the prominent angular lantern poking above the roofline and with both in proximity to a small first floor rear bedroom window. This impact could not be addressed by conditions relating to the final design of the lantern.
12. I acknowledge the proposal is seeking a more contemporary approach to the fenestration of the building in a modern extension and the appellant's contention that existing later windows were a contrived attempt at matching existing. However, they did not appear artificial and I do not share the appellant's view that using such fenestration simply because it is in a modern extension would result in a harmonious design. On the contrary, the changes to the fenestration would be inharmonious to this particular building and would result in an erosion of the building's special architectural and historic interest and its significance as a designated heritage asset.
13. In reaching this view I acknowledge that the works (which are also development) would not be readily visible from the public realm, but listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether or not public or private views of the building can be gained.
14. For the reasons given above the proposal would, in terms of the changes to the fenestration fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. I return to the development plan and national policy below.

Bassingbourn Conservation Area

15. The property is situated within the Bassingbourn Conservation Area (BCA) and despite the harm that would be caused to the listed building, I must assess harm to the BCA as a whole. I have not been provided with any appraisal for the BCA or an assessment of its significance from either party. I observed that the significance of the BCA is mainly derived from its wide range of historic buildings of varying forms, sizes, composition, design and appearance and spread out intermittently on both sides of the High Street and beyond. In accordance with a settlement of this age and size I also observed modern infill and other development within the BCA along with various alterations and extensions utilising modern composite materials.
16. North and South End run north to south through the heart of the BCA at the intersection of Brock Road, South End and the High Street. These areas contain looser forms of development commensurate with its peripheral location between the settlement and its surrounding rural areas along with a high number of fine examples of listed buildings and former farmsteads. North End has a more verdant sylvan character and appearance than High street with individual buildings set back from the highway behind open space and mature trees. Historic

buildings, including the church and former farmsteads are seen within this context and reveal themselves at certain points within the street.

17. The appeal property is only a small part of the BCA but nevertheless a positive contributor to its character and appearance. Because I have identified harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building, which is a positive contributor the proposal would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the BCA.

Other considerations and conclusion

18. In this case I am determining both s78 and s20 appeals. However, listed building appeals are not subject to Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Although such appeals do not therefore need to be determined in accordance with the plan, the relevant provisions are still capable of being material considerations.
19. Policies HQ/1² and NH/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan require amongst other things a high-quality design and that development proposals should sustain and enhance the special character and distinctiveness of the district's historic environment including its building traditions and details. For the reasons given above that would not be the case here.
20. However, the policy also states support will be given in accordance with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework terms (the Framework). In Framework paragraph 215 terms the harms from the proposal would be less than substantial and therefore have to be weighed against the public benefits.
21. The works and development would improve the current living arrangements for the appellant's family but these are ultimately private benefits. The works would also improve the visibility of some historic features and there would be some small energy efficiency and economic benefits from the proposal and improvements to fire safety. On the evidence before me the continued viable use of the building is not dependent on the proposal as there is nothing to suggest that the ongoing residential use would cease in its absence.
22. The public benefits are not sufficient to outweigh the considerable importance and weight that I must give to the less than substantial harms that would occur even if those harms would be toward the lower end of the scale. There is no evidence from the parties that the development plan is out of date for the purposes of the Framework and the proposals would not accord with an up-to-date plan.
23. For the reasons given above, in both appeals the proposal would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the building, thus failing to satisfy the requirements of the Act, the development plan and the Framework.
24. Material considerations, including the Framework do not indicate that decisions should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

R Aston

INSPECTOR

² Referred to in the Officer Report but not the Decision Notice.