



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 13 November 2025

by E Catcheside BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 DECEMBER 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/J1915/W/25/3365355

The Nook, Upwick Green, Albury, Hertfordshire SG11 2JX

- 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 Ms Ward against the decision of East Herts Council.
 - The application reference is 3/24/2299/HH.
 - The development proposed is timber conservatory.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/J1915/Y/25/3365357

The Nook, Upwick Green, Albury, Hertfordshire SG11 2JX

- 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 Ms Ward against the decision of East Herts Council.
 - The application reference is 3/24/2300/LBC.
 - The works proposed are timber conservatory
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The two appeals relate to the same site and the same scheme. The difference between them is that Appeal A seeks planning permission for the development whilst Appeal B seeks consent for the proposed works to the listed building. The two appeals are covered by separate legislative regimes. However, I have dealt with them together to avoid unnecessary duplication.
4. As the proposal relates 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).
5. Throughout this decision, I have referred to the appeal property as The Nook to reflect its current name and the address in the banner heading. However, for the avoidance of doubt, the property is referred to as “Tatts Cottage” on the statutory list¹ and I have had regard to the list entry in my consideration of the appeals.

¹ List entry number 1308098

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building now known as The Nook or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

Special interest and significance

7. The Nook is a Grade II listed timber framed cottage with a thatched roof, dating from the 17th-18th Century. The property has been substantially extended to the rear in more recent years, which has significantly altered the form, proportions, and appearance of the building. However, the historic part of the building, with its low-slung form and long sweep of thatch, has a distinctive appearance that remains apparent in views from the road and from the private garden due to the surviving historic fabric. This enables the architecture, materials, and construction methods from the period in which the building was constructed to be experienced and understood.
8. The significance of the building, insofar as it is relevant to these appeals, is derived from its age and its architectural and historic interest as a timber framed, thatched cottage, which evidences post-medieval development in this area. The spacious garden, amenity, and circulation areas around the property form part of its setting. These aspects of the setting contribute to the special interest of the building by allowing it to be appreciated from various aspects; albeit that some of these views are not publicly accessible.

Effects of the proposal

9. The proposed conservatory would, in and of itself, be a reasonably modest structure. However, it would not exist in isolation and the effects of this proposal on the listed building must necessarily take account of alterations that have already occurred. In that regard, the conservatory would add to the bulk, mass, and footprint of the more modern parts of the building that have previously been constructed; and it would exacerbate their cumulatively disproportionate scale when compared to the more humble proportions of the building's historic core.
10. Whilst the extensive use of glazing and the mono-pitched roof would differentiate the conservatory as a modern addition, there would be an awkward relationship with the post-medieval building due, in part, to the relatively small-size of the historic windows and the traditional materials. Moreover, the eaves of the proposed sloping roof would rise above the deeply over-hanging eaves of the thatch at proximity, thus adding to the harmful upscaling of the existing rearward additions. Whilst the conservatory would not be physically attached to the historic part of the cottage, which would remain intact, it would conceal a large part of the surviving traditional rear wall that remains exposed, thus detracting further from the historic and architectural features that contribute to the special interest of the building.
11. Some views of the traditional facade and eaves of the property could remain visible through the glass exterior of the conservatory. However, in all reasonable likelihood, those views would be obscured by the timber supports, glazing bars, and domestic items such as furniture. Consequently, the proposal would detract

from the ability to appreciate the historic form and traditional materials of the cottage from the outdoor amenity areas on this side of the building.

12. Views of the conservatory would be largely screened from the lane, from where the historic form and proportions of the cottage could continue to be appreciated. However, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent special interest, irrespective of whether any changes to it could be observed from public vantage points.
13. The Council indicates that the property has been extended to the maximum size that would be acceptable on this site. It is not for me to predetermine any potential future proposals that could come forward in this regard. Nonetheless, I find the proposed conservatory would harmfully erode the significance of the listed building due to its siting, height, design, and proximity to the historic built form, as well as its contribution to the cumulative scale and appearance of the relatively modern additions and their relationship with the modest cottage.
14. Therefore, and with regard to my duty under sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Act, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed building now known as The Nook. Consequently, the proposal would cause harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset.

Heritage balance

15. The harm that would be caused to the listed building would be less than substantial, and to a moderate degree due to the nature and scale of the changes that have already occurred to the rear of the property. I ascribe great weight to the conservation of the listed cottage, as I am required to do by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The Framework states that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification; and that the less than substantial harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
16. The materials used in the construction of the conservatory would be sustainably sourced, and the new structure would be energy efficient thus helping to mitigate climate change for the public good. There would also be some economic benefits arising through the construction process. Collectively, these are public benefits that weigh in favour of the scheme.
17. However, the principal benefit of the scheme would be a private benefit, arising through the provision of additional accommodation to meet the personal wishes of the current occupiers. However, whilst these wishes are understandable, the development and the works would not conserve the heritage asset in a manner that would be appropriate to its significance. Consequently, the public benefits in this case would not be sufficient to outweigh the considerable weight and importance that I ascribe to the heritage harm.
18. Overall, the harm that would be caused to the significance of this Grade II listed cottage brings the proposal into conflict with Policies HA1 and HA7 of the East Herts District Plan (October 2018) which, taken together, seek to preserve and enhance the historic environment and to ensure that proposals do not adversely affect the architectural and historic character or appearance of a listed building or its setting. There would also be conflict with the historic environment provisions within the Framework.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, Appeal A is dismissed and Appeal B is dismissed.

E Catchside

INSPECTOR