



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 27 August 2025

by Jennifer Wallace BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th January 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/P0240/Y/25/3363790

Tyrells End Cottage, Tyrells End, Eversholt, Central Bedfordshire MK17 9DS

- 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 Guy Barker against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is CB/25/00125/LB.
 - The works proposed are demolition of conservatory, outbuilding and detached garage, construction of single storey rear extension including glazed link hallway, construction of basement floor with walk-on roof lights and installation of air source heat pump.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/P0240/D/25/3363786

Tyrells End Cottage, Tyrells End, Eversholt, Central Bedfordshire, MK17 9DS

- 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 Guy Barker against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is CB/25/00124/FULL.
 - The development proposed is demolition of conservatory, outbuilding and detached garage, construction of single storey rear extension including glazed link hallway, construction of basement floor with walk-on roof lights and installation of air source heat pump.
-

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. The 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.
5. I have used the description of development and works from the appeal forms as it has been indicated that an amended description was agreed during the Council's consideration of the applications.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:

- the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building Tyrells End Cottage; and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Eversholt Conservation Area (Appeals A and B);
- whether the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies (Appeal B);
- the effect on the openness of the Green Belt (Appeal B);
- whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by any other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal (Appeal B).

Reasons

Heritage Assets

Special Interest and Significance

7. Tyrells End Cottage¹ (the Cottage) is a 17th century property, which was reworked in the late 18th and 19th centuries. It has a visible timber frame, infilled with brick and a thatched roof with a central chimney. It is a well sized property, reflecting the fact it has previously been two dwellings.
8. The appellant's evidence identifies the significance of the Cottage as "the survival of the timber frame structure in the locally distinctive traditional 17th and 18th century vernacular appearance, reflecting the required changes in repair and structural upgrading approach and fashions adopting a quasi-*cottage ornee* style, involving eyebrow dormer windows and then with the part red brick encasement of the original timber frame". Further to this, I would add that the legibility of the building's historic form and layout is an important contributor to the special interest and therefore significance of the Cottage.
9. The site lies within the Eversholt Conservation Area (CA). Its character and appearance are mainly derived from its dispersed pattern of development and modest vernacular structures. The Cottage lies towards the northern edge of the CA. It makes a positive contribution to the CA as a whole as a very good example of a vernacular dwelling.

Effects of Appeal Proposal

10. The form of the Cottage is of a wide, but shallow property. The proposed extension, due to its length, would have a mass and bulk that would appear poorly related to this existing layout. This would harm the appreciation of the historic plan form of the dwelling. It would alter the authenticity of how the building is experienced from the rear garden with a long off-shoot rather than the width of the traditional form. The proposed glazed walkway and extension would obscure the historic fabric of the rear elevation of the property, further adversely affecting how the Cottage is

¹ List Entry Number: 1113970 Date first listed: 23 January 1961 Date of most recent amendment: 16 March 1987

perceived and its significance appreciated. There is also a lack of detail around the junction of the glazed link with the historic core of the building. The proposal would also harm the character and appearance of the CA as a whole by introducing a substantial extension to a modest vernacular property.

11. The proposed extension would be lower in height than the body of the property and would be clearly narrower in width. While the proposal would be lesser in scale in these respects, the depth of the proposed extension would be such that it would not be subservient to the overall form of the Cottage.
12. The applications were not accompanied by details of the proposed air source heat pump. The appeal proposal is accompanied by an indicative example. The submitted plans indicate that the external equipment would be sited immediately adjacent to the existing building. In the absence of precise details, the effect of this on the special interest and significance of the Cottage cannot be assessed. It cannot be assumed that the appearance of such equipment would be known or that the installation of pipework and cabling would be acceptable with respect to the statutory duties associated with a listed building. Such uncertainty means this is not a matter which could be reasonably dealt with by condition. The fact the Conservation Officer did not raise this does not prevent the local planning authority, as the decision maker, from reaching its own conclusions on this matter. Nor do other decisions of the Council affect my assessment of this.
13. It may be that a proposal with a clear distinction between the different phases of development has been acceptable elsewhere. However, that would not alter my assessment of the proposal before me. The Council has not raised any concerns with respect to the materials, roof or pattern of fenestration proposed and I have no reason to find otherwise. This would amount to a lack of harm and so would be neutral in my assessment.
14. It also may be that the proposal complies with the guidance set out in the Central Bedfordshire Council Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document. However, such a document would provide generic advice on design. It would not outweigh specific findings reached with respect to the effects of the proposal on the listed building, where other considerations apply.
15. I find that the proposal would not preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed building Tyrells End Cottage. 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 Heritage 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 to the listed building, I find that the harm to its significance I have identified 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 less than substantial and would be at the very lower end of that category. 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 while the development and works are carried out however these would be limited given the small scale of the proposal. The conservatory and outbuilding had been removed at the time of my site visit. The proposal would also involve the removal of the garage which did remain in place. There would be a heritage benefit from the removal of these, as it would allow the wide front and rear elevations of the Cottage to be appreciated without visual distraction. This would better reveal the significance of the listed building and, to a lesser extent, the CA. However, any benefit in this respect and the weight it carries is considerably moderated by the proposed extension and its resultant harms.
19. There would be a public benefit from the installation of an air source heat pump with respect to the environmental benefits from technologies that can make better use of renewable energy. I acknowledge there are national schemes to support the transition to renewable and low carbon technologies. However as the proposal is for one dwelling, I attach limited weight to this.
20. Additional accommodation in a layout more suited to the appellant's requirements, while understandable, would provide a personal benefit to the appellant only. There is no substantive evidence before me that the development and works are 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.
21. The proposal would have a harmful effect on the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building Tyrells End Cottage. It would also fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This 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 Central Bedfordshire Local Plan 2015 – 2035 (July 2021) (LP) Policies HQ1 and HE3, which taken together require proposals to respond positively to their context and where possible, preserve, sustain and enhance the special character, significance, appearance and /or special architectural or historic interest of the assets.

Green Belt

Whether Inappropriate Development

22. The site is located within the South Bedfordshire Green Belt. The Framework identifies at paragraph 142 that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Paragraphs 154 and 155 of the Framework confirm that development is inappropriate in the Green Belt unless it is one of the exceptions listed.
23. LP Policy SP4 confirms that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt and that proposals will be assessed in

accordance with government guidance contained in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.

24. Paragraph 154 c) of the Framework sets out one such exception is for the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The Framework does not define 'disproportionate additions', however the glossary defines original building as a building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was originally built. The Central Bedfordshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2023) (SPD) provides further guidance on extensions to dwellings within the Green Belt, setting out that to be considered proportionate, the original building should not be added to by more than 60% and that the impact of the proposal in terms of massing and design will also be considered.
25. The proposed extension would be attached to the existing dwelling via a narrow single storey glazed extension which would have a flat metal roof. This would lead to a rectangular timber clad extension consisting of a basement extension served by a lightwell, and ground floor extension with a sunken ground level. It would have a substantial crown roof to be covered in clay tiles other than a rooflight and the glazed flat section of the roof.
26. The host building has an elongated frontage with only limited depth. The proposed extension would be considerably deeper than this and so would project some considerable distance beyond the rear elevation of the host property. This depth would result in the proposed extension appearing disproportionately deep, with an excessive mass and bulk when viewed in conjunction with the host dwelling. This would be exacerbated by the separation provided by the glazed link which would serve to add an element of visual detachment between the host property and the proposed extension.
27. The parties are in agreement that, following the removal of the conservatory, outbuilding and garage, the proposal would remain within the 60% identified in the SPD with respect to footprint and floorspace. While the Council's officer report expressed some concern with respect to the volume of the proposed extension, there are no figures put forward. Notwithstanding, an assessment as to whether a proposal would be a disproportionate extension is not only a numerical exercise. Even if the volume increase were to be less than 60%, it would not change my assessment that the proposal would visually appear as a disproportionate extension to the host property.
28. For these reasons, the appeal proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt as it would not meet any of the exceptions set out in paragraphs 154 and 155 of the Framework and so would fail to be in accordance with LP Policy SP4. Paragraph 153 confirms that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Openness

29. Paragraph 142 of the Framework confirms that 'the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence'. Openness is the absence of development and can have spatial as well as visual aspects.

30. Although the garage lies only a short distance from the host property, it is nonetheless a considerable detached structure which projects to the rear of the host property. It adds to the perceived width of development across the frontage of the plot. The proposed extension would lie behind the property, sit within the confines of the domestic plot and reduce the overall number of structures. Considering the overall proposal, I find that the effect on the visual and spatial openness of the green belt would be neutral and so would not be in conflict with LP Policy SP4 or the provisions of the Framework.

Other Considerations

31. Planning permission² and listed building consent³ remain extant for a proposal with a broadly similar description to these appeals. I have no reason to consider this would not be carried out were these appeals to be dismissed. They therefore represent a realistic fallback position. I have floor plans of this proposal in the evidence before me, but not elevations. It is clear from the floorplans that the approved extension would be shorter in length. While this would be by a relatively short amount, it does mean that the extant proposal would be less harmful in terms of its disproportionate appearance and harm to the significance of the listed building. It would also result in less of the rear elevation of the Cottage being obscured by the proposed glazed link which further reduces the harm in terms of how the historic fabric is appreciated. While the submitted plans show the retention of the existing openings to the sitting room, I do not have details of the approved alteration. I therefore cannot be certain that this would constitute a benefit of the extant scheme which would outweigh the other harms I have identified. Overall, the approved scheme would result in less harm to the special interest of the listed building. The fallback therefore does not weigh in support of the development and works.
32. The environmental economic and heritage benefits which would arise from the proposal are set out above. Given the nature and extent of the development and works, these carry limited weight.
33. While it may be that pre-application advice was the opinion of that particular planning officer, the Council has provided cogent reasons for the decisions it reached. The nature of any involvement of the Conservation Officer in pre-application discussions is not within the scope of these appeals. I have been provided with the comments of the Conservation Officer on the proposal and have taken them into consideration when reaching my decisions.
34. The Cottage is set in a large plot, as are many of the surrounding properties. There would not be an adverse effect on the living conditions of surrounding occupiers. Suitable provision for parking could be provided within the plot. There would not be an adverse effect on surrounding trees and landscaping. Protected species would not be harmed as a result of the proposal. Archaeology was addressed in the extant permission and could also be controlled by condition. However these are to be expected of any well designed development and so would be neutral in my assessment.

² CB/24/03047/FULL allowed 31/12/2024

³ CB/24/03048/LB allowed 31/12/2025

Green Belt Balance

35. I have found that the proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. I afford this matter substantial weight. While I found the effect on openness would be neutral, this weighs neither for nor against the proposal. It would also fail to preserve the Grade II listed building or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, causing harm to its significance. The harm to its significance would not be sufficiently outweighed by the public benefits accruing from the proposal.
36. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the harm to the Green Belt, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The other considerations in this case do not clearly outweigh the harm that I have identified. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with the provisions within the Framework which seek to protect the Green Belt and would not comply with LP Policy SP4.

Other Matters

37. Tyrells End Farmhouse⁴ is a Grade II* listed building likely dating from the 15th century. Its special interest and significance is derived from its architectural and historic interest as a vernacular timber framed farmhouse demonstrating the agricultural history of the area. Its setting as it relates to this appeal is primarily its associated buildings, and the open countryside beyond which still displays some historic field patterns. The proposal, while in proximity, would not alter the domestic character of the appeal site nor be visually intrusive in the setting of Tyrells Farmhouse. It would therefore preserve the setting and not harm the significance of the listed building.

Conclusions

38. Appeal A: For the reasons given, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.
39. Appeal B: 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 the appeal should be dismissed

Jennifer Wallace

INSPECTOR

⁴ List Entry Number: 1311955 Date first listed: 16-Mar-1987