



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 6 October 2025

by **Helen Heward BSc (Hons) MRTPI**

Decision date: 5 November 2025

Appeal A: APP/F2605/W/25/3361495

1 The Row, Weeting, Brandon, IP27 0QG

- 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 & Mrs J. & E. Delarre & Rees against the decision of Breckland Council.
 - The application reference is 3PL/2024/0506/HOU.
 - The development proposed is Single storey rear extension and internal alterations to Grade II listed building including the addition of new detached outbuilding to be used as office.
-

Appeal B: APP/F2605/Y/25/3361503

1 The Row, Weeting, Brandon, IP27 0QG

- 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 & Mrs J. & E. Delarre & Rees against the decision of Breckland Council.
 - The application reference is 3PL/2024/0507/LB.
 - The works proposed are Single storey rear extension and internal alterations to Grade II listed building including the addition of new detached outbuilding to be used as office.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The proposals described on the decision notices and application forms differ. The Local Highway Authority objected to a proposed car parking area within the rear garden of the property which was to be served via a new vehicular access onto C873 Lynn Road (both of which the LHA previously objected to). The applicant

deleted the parking and access to overcome the highway objection. Accordingly, I have used the description of the proposals as set out on the decision notices.

4. I am considering the decisions made by the Council, and advice given at the time of the application by individual officers are not determinative.
5. As set out above, there are two appeals on the site. Appeal A relates to the refusal of planning permission. Appeal B concerns the refusal of listing building consent for the works considered under Appeal B. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the schemes together.
6. As the proposals relate to a listed building, I have had special regard to sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act).

Main Issues

7. The main issues are whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building known as “1 The Row” (Ref: 1172193) (the LB), and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

8. No 1 The Row is a one and a half storey terrace cottage. It is the end one of ten cottages, all subject of the same Listing. Built in the 18th & 19th Century, they are constructed of colour washed brick with continuous thatched roof and have a continuous outshut to the rear.
9. Between 2007 and 2011, the LB underwent repairs and remedial works due to failing structural support and damage caused by fire. However, the terrace has retained its simple linear form, with the outshut to the rear. I am informed that small, flat-roof extensions have been added to adjoining properties. However, the terrace appears little altered externally and maintains its integrity and authenticity as a modestly scaled row of traditionally constructed cottages.
10. There is an existing outbuilding in the rear garden, a short distance from the outshut. It is rectangular with a flat roof and, in views from the footpath alongside the road, and open space nearby, the top can be seen peeping above the fence.
11. From the listing description and the evidence before me, I find the special interest of the LB, insofar as it relates to these appeals, is drawn from the simple linear form, modest scale and proportions of the terrace, as well as the traditional design, repetitive features, and uniform materials of the terrace as a whole. The Appellants agree that it is a fine demonstration of traditional materials composed in a vernacular style typical of a rural Norfolk dwelling.
12. The existing ground floor of the cottage consists of a living room, small kitchen and small dining room and bathroom. The proposals are to extend to the rear and create a linked living/kitchen/dining area, with the existing ground floor layout remodelled to provide two bedrooms, dining room, and [existing] bathroom. The Appellants consider that the use of a flat roof would help maintain a low overall building height. They consider that stepping the roof and incorporating a glazed connection would provide a clear visual break, and that the new structure would remain subordinate to the host dwelling.

13. The Appellants suggest that the proposals would result in a sensitive and careful addition to the rear facade because the proposals would result in a visually distinct, recessive and subservient addition, clearly distinguished from the host dwelling with a minimalistic design using a contrasting high quality palette of materials including vertical timber cladding. A window and door would be altered but the Appellants suggest that key features including eyebrow windows, chimneys and dormers would not be impacted. The Appellants argue that the proposals have been carefully considered to respond to the heritage significance of both the site and building and would be a positive addition to the LB, demonstrating a clear built chronology, reinforcing the historic character.
14. However, the extension would create a large rear extension that would add considerably to the ground floor plan. The extension would be taller than the outshut and almost as long as the width of the gable end of the LB, including the outshut. The proposals would create a significant rear projection at odds with the linear form of the terrace and overly large in comparison to the scale of the modest terraced cottage.
15. The proposed glazed link would cut into a large section of the roof of the outshut, breaking the simple uniform line, eroding the architectural integrity of the rear elevation of the LB, overwhelming and detracting from the simple yet distinctive linear form of the terrace.
16. On my visit I observed that the top and roof of the extension would be seen quite clearly above the fence from both the public highway and nearby public open space. The width of the linked building would appear much wider than the first-floor gable of the cottage. And the extension would compromise the ability to see and read the roof of the terrace with its simple linear form.
17. In comparison to the existing outbuilding, the proposed extension would be somewhat taller, have a more solid construction and be physically attached to the LB by a link. On my visit I could not see any other garden structures of comparable scale in the gardens of other properties that comprise the LB.
18. I am not persuaded that there is evidence to say the proposed materials and execution would not be of a high quality. Nor that the use of contrasting materials would be unacceptable in principle. Even so, in light of my findings above, I conclude that the scale and form of the proposals would fail to preserve the special interest of the LB.
19. Paragraph 212 of 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. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. 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. In this instance, the harm would be less than substantial but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.
20. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimal viable use.

21. The Appellants suggest that the proposal would ensure the continued use and preservation of the heritage asset by making it more suitable and adaptable to the modern standards of living for a young family and home-based working. The Appellants argue that many historic buildings struggle to remain viable due to outdated layouts or structural constraints that do not align with modern living standards. Therefore, they argue, extending this property will improve the current cramped living conditions fulfilling the applicants' needs which will allow them to continue to look after, repair and restore the heritage asset. I note that in 2020 listed building consent was granted for the removal of a partition stud wall within No 1 The Row to create a larger living space internally at ground floor.
22. The property affords limited accommodation with, amongst other things, a small bathroom and kitchen and the proposals would provide the occupiers with improved accommodation. But these would be private benefits for the Appellants, and I am not persuaded that there is evidence to say that the existing property is not capable of being restored to make it suitable for modern use. I am informed that No 1 The Row was in a severe state of disrepair and that the Appellants have undertaken window and door repairs, removed concrete render and modern paint, repointed, and replastered in lime, and rethatched the ridge. But these are not public benefits arising from the proposals before me.
23. The contribution that the proposals would make to reducing commuting, carbon emissions, congestion on local roads, support nearby businesses and enhance local economic activity would be de-minimis public benefits given that they relate to just one dwelling.
24. In summary, there are no public benefits that would outweigh the harm that would be caused, and I conclude that the proposals would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II listed building. The proposals would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act. It would also conflict with requirements of Breckland Local Plan (2023) Policy GEN02 Promoting High Quality design, and Policy ENV07 which, amongst other things, require that development respects and is sensitive to the character of the surrounding area, respects and is sensitive to the character of the surrounding area, makes a positive architectural and urban design contribution to its context and location and that development that will affect a designated heritage asset should conserve the architectural and historic character, appearance and setting of the asset.

Conclusion

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

Helen Heward

INSPECTOR