



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2025

by Simon Hand MA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/K0235/F/24/3346112

Green End Farmhouse, Green End, Pertenhall, Bedfordshire, MK44 2AX

- The appeal is made under section 39 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.
- The appeal is made by Mr Miles Dean and Ms Zoe Wyatt against a listed building enforcement notice issued by Bedford Borough Council
- The enforcement notice was issued on 9 May 2024.
- The contravention of listed building control alleged in the notice is: without listed building consent the carrying out of the following works; (i) Demolition and reconstruction of the three offset diagonal shafts located on the external chimney stack on the north elevation of the rear wing, as well as repointing works to the brick base using a cementitious mortar; (ii) Introduction of full-height timber panelling built off new internal stud walls c.100mm from the internal face of three walls within the dining room and four walls within the snug; (iii) The removal of plaster to one wall within the dining room and repointing the brick wall using a cementitious mortar; (iv) The replacement of a historic planked door with a solid door located in the opening between the kitchen and the dining room.
- The requirements of the notice are:
 - (i) Repoint the brick base to the chimneys and make repairs to the brickwork, taking the following steps:
 - Step 1: Using hand tools only, carefully rake out the mortar in the brick chimney base to a minimum depth of at least one-and-a-half times the width of the joints,
 - Step 2: By hand, carefully cut out any bricks which have been damaged in the process of undertaking Step 1 and replace with handmade soft red bricks to match to the historic brickwork in all respects;
 - Step 3: Brush out the joints and thoroughly wet with clean water,
 - Step 4: Using a 1 part (by volume) NHL 3.5 hydraulic lime to 2.5 parts sharp sand mortar mix, fill the wetted joints with the mortar and finish flush with the surface of the brickwork;
 - Step 5: Push the mortar slightly back from the face of the brickwork to reveal the arrises of the brickwork, ensuring that the mortar face is parallel with the face of the brickwork;
 - Step 6: Using a stiff, dry brush, brush and tamp the joints to reveal the exposed aggregate and ensure all excess mortar to the face of the brickwork is cleaned off by hand.
 - (ii) Take down and rebuild the chimney shafts in accordance with the details shown on the attached plan in Appendix 2, taking the following steps:
 - Step 1: Using hand tools only, carefully remove each of the three chimney shafts completely to the base and set aside any salvageable historic bricks for re-use;
 - Step 2: Rebuild the three chimney shafts exactly in accordance with the plan attached in Appendix 2, using a combination of the cleaned salvaged historic bricks and new handmade, soft red bricks to exactly match to the historic bricks in all respects. The brickwork shall be laid in a 1 part (by volume) NHL 3.5 hydraulic lime to 2.5 parts sharp sand mortar mix. The mortar shall be pushed slightly back from the face of the brickwork to reveal the arrises of the brickwork, ensuring that the mortar face is parallel with the face of the brickwork (as shown in Figure 1). The

mortar will be brushed and tamped back to reveal the exposed aggregate and any excess mortar on the face of the brickwork shall be cleaned by hand.

(iii) To the walls marked in blue on the attached plan in Appendix 3, remove all timber panelling, stud framing and any insulation located within the newly formed walls. Once removed, make good any damage by finishing to match surrounding wall finishes.

(iv) To the wall marked in red on the attached plan in Appendix 3, reinstate a lime plaster finish to the wall, taking the following steps:

Step 1 – Starting at the top of the wall, wet the surface one day before applying the scratch coat, and again on the day of applying the scratch coat. Any deep recesses in the brickwork or mortar should be dubbed out using a 1 part (by volume) 2.5 NHL hydraulic lime putty to 2.5 parts sharp sand mix and allowed to dry;

Step 2 – Apply a scratch coat consisting of 1 part (by volume) lime putty to 2.5 parts sharp sand to an overall thickness no greater than 15mm. Whilst still wet, scratch the surface with a pronged lath scratcher in horizontal and vertical straight lines to create a lattice pattern. Leave to dry for at least 5 days;

Step 3 – Once dried, apply a float coat over the scratch coat consisting of 1 part (by volume) lime putty to 3 parts sharp sand to an overall thickness no greater than 15mm. Whilst still wet, a floating rule should be used to achieve a level finish. Once stiffened out, rub up the surface of the wall using a wooden float. Once the surface has compacted, rub over the wall surface using a devil float. Leave to dry for at least 5 days;

Step 4 – Once dried, lightly dampen the scratch coat and apply a finishing coat consisting of 1 part (by volume) lime putty to one part fine silica sand, applied over two layers worked in alternate directions to an overall thickness no greater than 5mm.

(v) To the opening marked in green in Appendix 3, remove the current door and reinstate a timber planked door with traditional ironmongery and painted black to match to the previous door in all respects.

- The period for compliance with the requirements is 6 months.
 - The appeal is made on the grounds set out in section 39(1) (e), (g), (h) and (j) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.
-

Decision

1. It is directed that the listed building enforcement notice be varied by the deletion of the period for compliance which is replaced by “*The period for compliance with requirements (i) and (ii) is 8 months and for requirements (iii), (iv) and (v) is 6 months*”; and the addition of the words “*or reinstate the original door currently held in store*” to the end of requirement (v). Subject to these variations the appeal is dismissed and the listed building enforcement notice is upheld. Listed building consent is refused for the retention of the works carried out in contravention of section 9 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

Reasons

2. The first allegation refers to the reconstruction of 3 chimney shafts to an external chimney and repointing of the brick base. The appellant accepts the requirements (i) and (ii) in order to put this right but wants more time to do so. Hand made bricks are needed and there is a lead time of 20-24 weeks to produce them. They also need to be agreed with the Council first. Weather issues also mean the work really needs to be carried out in the spring and summer.
3. The Council argue that the appellant has had plenty of time already and 6 months from the date of issue of the decision letter is generous enough. I agree, however,

the decision letter will be issued in January so an extension of time to 8 months will encompass the entire summer and should provide plenty of time to order, agree, and manufacture the bricks and carry out the works. To that extent the appeal succeeds on ground (h).

4. The second allegation concerns panelling in the dining room and snug. The appellant has two arguments, firstly that the original finish was not historic but modern cement plaster. Very little evidence has been provided to support this claim, but even if it was the case, and the modern finish extended across all the walls that have been subsequently panelled that does not mean the panelling itself is an acceptable solution.
5. The second argument is that the panelling is acceptable as it reflects the historic status of the house and would have been typical of a house of this type. I think there is a danger when considering 'status' of ascribing values such as low, or high and then being funnelled down a particular route thereafter. It is better to consider the building as a whole. It was originally a 17th century farmhouse with some later re-fenestration, but not, apparently, any major external alterations. It is not particularly substantial and certainly has no pretensions to gentrification. The photographs of the interior of the rooms in question when the property was purchased show what would be expected of a farmhouse of the period - white washed walls with exposed internal beams. I share the Council's view that a re-imagining of the interior is entirely unnecessary.
6. The panelling has been carried out to a high standard but the rooms now appear to belong to a different house, perhaps one belonging to minor gentry. There is no evidence the house was ever panelled, nor that it ever aspired to such treatment. There is an interesting plaster frieze in the lounge but the Council suggest that was imported from nearby Kimbolton Castle. The re-use of a plaster frieze in one room does not hint at any pretensions to higher status. In my view the panelling does affect the significance of the listed building and there are no public benefits (or any benefits) to offset the harm. Removing the beading would not help, the rooms need to be returned to their more functional original appearance as detailed in the requirements.
7. The third allegation refers to the loss of plaster in the dining room and repointing of the wall with cement. The appellant accepts this but requires more time to carry out the works detailed in requirement (iv). This is a straightforward reinstatement of the lime plaster, which would presumably be carried out at the same time as requirement (iii) which deals with the panelling. There is no specific reason why 6 months is considered too short to arrange for these works so this part of the appeal fails.
8. The fourth allegation refers to the replacement of a panelled door between the kitchen and dining room. The removed door dated from the 18th century, so was not original, but clearly was part of the historic fabric of the house at the time of listing. The appellant argues the new door is fire retardant and excludes draughts as the old door was badly fitting. The new door is a featureless modern door which clearly has to go, as it harms the significance of the listed building. The question is what to replace it with. The requirement is a new timber planked door with traditional ironmongery and painted black. It should match the old door "in all respects", but I assume that does not include making it ill-fitting. However, the old door has been retained in store and I was able to see it there. Both parties

express a preference to re-use this old door. However, Its state of repair did seem to bear out the appellant's argument concerning draughts and fire. The Council are happy for the old door to be replaced, as is the appellant, but a 'new' timber plank door would seem to me to resolve the problems of the old door while retaining a semblance of authenticity. Consequently I shall vary the requirement to allow for either option.

Simon Hand

INSPECTOR