



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 2 October 2025

by Jennifer Wallace BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/J0540/W/25/3368296

The Barn, 43A High Street, Maxey, Peterborough PE6 9EE

- 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 and Mrs Stewart against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00254/HHFUL.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension and increase in width to existing opening to rear elevation.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/J0540/Y/25/3368295

The Barn, 43A High Street, Maxey, Peterborough PE6 9EE

- 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 and Mrs Stewart against the decision of Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00255/LBC.
 - The works proposed are single storey rear extension and increase in width to existing opening to rear elevation.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A: The appeal is dismissed.
2. Appeal B: The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. These decisions address both planning and listed building consent appeals for the same site and the same scheme. To prevent duplication and for the avoidance of doubt, I have dealt with both appeals within a single decision letter.
4. These appeals relate to a listed building within a conservation area. I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) which require me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Main Issue

5. The main issue for both appeals is the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building Barn Immediately West South West Of Woodgate House, High Street (the Barn) and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Maxey Conservation Area.

Reasons

Special Interest and Significance

6. The Barn¹ is an 18th century former barn, converted to residential use sometime in the late 1970s/early 1980s. It is constructed in coursed stone, with a Collyweston slate roof. Its previous use can still be discerned through the retention of the large opening that would previously have been the barn door on the front elevation and the distinctive triangular infills of what would previously have been used as ventilation holes. It displays the long frontage and relatively narrow plan form typical of buildings of its age in the village, albeit with a perpendicular projection which the map regressions show was likely historically longer.
7. From the evidence before me, the special interest and significance of the listed building lies in its architectural and historic interest as a modest 18th century vernacular farm building displaying use of local traditional construction techniques and materials. The building's special interest has been compromised by its conversion to residential. Nonetheless, its historic form and function remain legible.
8. The site lies within the Maxey Conservation Area (CA). Its character and appearance are mainly derived from its evolution as a rural settlement in an area of dry farmland at the edge of fenlands. The use of limestone and Collyweston slate to vernacular dwellings and former agricultural buildings adds to its historic character. The Barn occupies a prominent position along High Street due to its position on the junction with Woodgate Lane. It makes a positive contribution to the CA as a whole due to its use of traditional materials and vernacular design.

Proposal and Effects

9. The proposal is for a single storey mono-pitch roof extension to the rear of the property. This would involve the removal of part of the rear elevation in what is currently the office to provide a more open plan living space. At my site visit I observed elements of the coursed stone and wooden lintel forming part of the interior elevation. This was only a small element of the elevation and there was no similar detailing in the living room elevation. The proposal would result in the loss of this historic fabric which, along with the wider removal proposed, would harm the historic legibility of the building.
10. The rear elevation of the property also displays one of the triangular ventilation holes noted in the listing description, providing that elevation with value in reflecting the previous use of the building. This is not diminished by the modern alterations to that elevation. While the plans show this fabric would be retained, it would then form an interior wall to the property. This would reduce the ability to appreciate the previous use of the building and how this is reflected in its features.
11. The internal layout of the building is entirely domestic and is unlikely to have any resemblance to the internal layout of its historic use. However, the Barn displays the typical proportions of vernacular buildings in Maxey of a long frontage and relatively narrow depth. The perpendicular projection does not detract from this historic form given its relationship to the core of the building and its subordinate form.

¹ List Entry Number: 1331590 Date first listed: 15 December 1955 Date of most recent amendment: 24 February 1982

12. However, the proposed extension would serve to increase the depth of the property by effectively widening it along the full length of the building. This would undermine the legibility of the historic form of the Barn and weaken an important characteristic of development in the CA. Although stepped in from the side elevation, this would only be a negligible amount. These harms would not be mitigated by the fact the Barn is clearly now a residential property arising from the domestic pattern of fenestration.
13. The use of a mono-pitch roof, large areas of glazing and board cladding would clearly distinguish the extension as a new phase in the development of the property. However, the proposal would appear as a clearly domestic extension to the property. It would contrast unfavourably with the robust vernacular character of the barn by further disrupting the solid to void ratio on the rear elevation. Even if it were perceived as taking influence from an open-bayed barn, there is no evidence to demonstrate this would be reflective or characteristic of previous layouts at this property.
14. Photographic records of other barns displaying a range of types of extension have been submitted. However, these photographs are without context. I do not know where these properties are, their relationship to surrounding development, heritage status or when they were extended. This would not justify extending this listed property in the manner proposed. The use of rooflights in a clearly modern extension would not be inherently harmful, but would not address the other harms I have identified
15. I find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building the Barn. This would be contrary to the requirements of sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Act. It would also fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA, contrary to s72(1) of the Act. Consequently, the proposal would harm the significance of both designated heritage assets.

Public Benefits and Balance

16. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of whether this would amount to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to significance. Paragraph 213 further advises that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.
17. Given the scale of the development and works proposed to the listed building, I find that the harm to its significance I have identified above would be less than substantial and at the lower end of that category. I find that the harm to the significance of the CA would also be at the lower end from the alterations to the traditional building layout and proportions. Nonetheless, these harms carry considerable importance and weight. In such circumstances, paragraph 215 of the Framework confirms that these harms should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes securing the asset's optimum viable use.
18. There would be economic benefits during the construction stage of the proposal. However, these would be limited due to the small scale of the proposal. I acknowledge there is some support from surrounding occupiers. The benefits of the proposal would principally be private benefits to the appellants. Their wish to create

a living space that would reflect their personal requirements is understandable. However, the development and works would not conserve the asset in a manner appropriate to its significance.

19. There is no substantive evidence before me that the proposal is required to secure the optimum viable use of the asset as a dwelling. Nor is there a clear and convincing justification for the development and works where I have found harm. Overall, in giving considerable importance and weight to the identified harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets, I find that this would not be outweighed by the public benefits arising from the proposal.
20. The proposed development and works would have a harmful effect on the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building Barn Immediately West South West Of Woodgate House and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Maxey Conservation Area. These would be contrary to the requirements of sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Act, and the provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment. It would also be in conflict with Peterborough Local Plan 2016 to 2036 (2019) Policies LP19 and LP16 which expect development to positively contribute to the local distinctiveness of the area and to protect and conserve Peterborough's rich and diverse heritage assets.

Other Matters

21. Woodgate House² is the farmhouse with which the barn was associated. This is likely to have been one of the grander farmhouses in Maxey, as the Barn has a Collyweston slate roof. Its significance insofar as it relates to this appeal also lies in its historic interest as to the development of agricultural buildings in the area and this is enhanced by the presence of the Barn within its setting. However, as a result of the development of housing around both buildings, this relationship is experienced in views of the frontages of the properties along High Street. The proposal would have a neutral effect on the setting and therefore special interest of Woodgate House.
22. The merits of a previously withdrawn planning application would not alter my assessment of this proposal. Nor are the comments of the Conservation Officer binding on subsequent proposals. There is no indication on the plans before me of a boundary wall forming part of the proposal. A separate mechanism exists to address whether buildings should remain listed.

Conclusions

23. Appeal A: The appeal proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate the decision should be taken otherwise. For the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed.
24. Appeal B: For the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal B should be dismissed.

Jennifer Wallace

INSPECTOR

² List Entry Number: 1126714 Date first listed: 15 December 1955 Date of most recent amendment: 24 February 1982 formerly listed as Woodgate Lane Farmhouse