



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 15 December 2025

by E Catcheside BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/V0510/W/25/3364809

Oak Farmhouse, Woodditton Road, Newmarket, Cambridge CB8 9PG

- 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 Simon Gooderham against the decision of East Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application reference is 24/00461/FUL.
 - The development proposed is removal of existing porch and replacement with a larger enclosed porch.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/V0510/Y/25/3364805

Oak Farmhouse, Woodditton Road, Newmarket, Cambridge CB8 9PG

- 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 Simon Gooderham against the decision of East Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application reference is 24/00462/LBC.
 - The works proposed are removal of existing porch and replacement with a larger enclosed porch.
-

Decision – Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for removal of existing porch and replacement with a larger enclosed porch at Oak Farmhouse, Woodditton Road, Newmarket, Cambridge CB8 9PG in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 24/00461/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: C-658-P-01 Rev C, C658-P-02 Rev A, and C658-P-04 Rev D
 - 3) No construction works above ground level shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Decision – Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for removal of existing porch and replacement with a larger enclosed porch at Oak Farmhouse, Woodditton Road, Newmarket, Cambridge CB8 9PG in accordance with the plans submitted with it, including C-658-P-01 Rev C, C658-P-02 Rev A, and C658-P-04 Rev D subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) No construction works above ground level shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 3) Any works of making good to the retained historic fabric that are associated with the works hereby consented shall be finished in materials to match the adjacent historic fabric.

Preliminary Matters

3. The two appeals relate to the same site and the same scheme but are considered under separate legislative regimes. I have dealt with the appeals together in my reasoning to avoid unnecessary duplication.
4. The Council accepted a revised drawing during the lifetime of the application, which reduced the footprint of the proposed porch from that originally submitted. The Council determined the applications based on the revised plan, and I have therefore taken the same approach with the appeals.
5. 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).

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building known as Oak Farmhouse (list entry number 1164287) and any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

Heritage asset, significance and setting

7. The appeal property is a Grade II listed farmhouse that has evolved in phases over a long period of time. The cross wing is the oldest part of the building. It is estimated to date from around the 16th Century, and it has an impressive rear facing gable with decorative window frames. The main range, with its plastered walls, hipped pantile roof, and distinctive lateral ridge stack was a later addition that is thought to have replaced an earlier hall in the 17th Century. In the 19th Century, a single-storey dairy with brick walls and a slate roof was added to the side of the property, concealing the base of the stack.
8. The property has been subject to more modern additions, including the existing enclosed porch, which was constructed to the front of the old dairy in 2003. A single storey rear extension was added in more recent years and now forms part of an open plan kitchen/breakfast room.
9. Notwithstanding the more modern additions, the historic phases of the building remain discernible due to the surviving historic fabric. The building can be appreciated from within its grounds but also from its wider rural setting due, in part, to its perpendicular orientation to the road, which allows its front and rear elevations to be observed when approaching the site along Woodditton Road.

10. Insofar as it is relevant to these appeals, the significance of Oak Farmhouse is derived from its age and the surviving historic fabric, which reveal information about the phased development of the building and its evolution through past eras. The rural setting also contributes to the significance of the property by enabling the building and its historic connection with the rural landscape and agricultural land uses to be appreciated and understood.
11. The existing front porch, with its painted brick walls and gable roof, has no architectural or historic interest. However, its small-size and low profile ensure it is subservient; and it does not harmfully detract from the features of historic and architectural interest that contribute to the significance of the listed building.

Effects of the proposal

12. Given that the existing porch is a relatively modern addition that does not contribute to the special historic and architectural interest of the listed building, no harm would arise through its removal. The proposed porch would be larger than the structure it would replace. However, it would remain subservient to the older parts of the building due to its relatively low height and width compared to the tall and long frontage of the historic building, and its set-in from the side boundary of the property. Moreover, the small increase in its depth would have a neutral effect on the form and proportions of the building overall because the existing porch already projects forward from the historic front façade. Taken together, these factors would ensure the proposed porch is a subordinate structure that is proportionate in size to the historic building.
13. Although the new porch extension would conceal a larger part of the 19th Century facade than is presently the case, there would be no significant loss of historic fabric; and the front wall of the former dairy would remain largely intact and discernible through the proposed window and from inside the porch and the kitchen. Moreover, its relatively low profile would preserve views of the exposed part of the lateral stack and the two-storey side wall of the farmhouse.
14. In a similar manner to the existing porch, the proposed extension would be in a reasonably discrete location at the furthest part of the building from the road. Its siting would also ensure that there would be no direct effects on the oldest parts of the building, namely the range and the cross-wing. Its gable fronted design would broadly reflect the shape of the existing porch as well as the modern rear breakfast room extension. It would therefore be legible as a contemporary phase in the evolution of this building which I find to be an appropriate response that safeguards the authenticity of this historic building. Moreover, subject to the details being agreed through conditions, the external materials would ensure the appearance of the porch would integrate with the historic windows, walls, and roof of the older phases of the building.
15. The Council invites me to find that the proposed porch would be disproportionately large for its stated purpose. However, I have not been directed to any statutory or locally adopted policy or guidance that sets an upper limit on the size of a porch or that provides limitations on its use and function. Rather, I find that the design of the proposed porch would be sympathetic to this historically sensitive site; and that through its size, design, and siting, it would preserve the architectural integrity of the building.

16. Overall, I find that the proposal would preserve the listed building known as Oak Farmhouse and the features of special architectural and historic interest that it possesses. It would therefore accord with Policy ENV12 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan April 2015 (as amended 2023) (LP) insofar as it seeks to ensure that proposals preserve or enhance the significance of listed buildings, are compatible with its character, and facilitate its preservation. In reaching this decision, I have had regard to my duties under the Act, and the great weight that I give to the conservation of the heritage asset as is required by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Conditions

17. The Council suggested a schedule of conditions for each appeal, which I have considered with regard to the tests for conditions as set out in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
18. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have imposed for both appeals, I have included a condition for Appeal A that lists the approved plans to provide certainty over the development that is permitted. It is not necessary for the plans condition to list other submitted documents, as those documents do not define the development permitted. It is also not necessary to include a plans condition in respect of Appeal B, because the listed building consent is for the works and plans as approved and as set out in my formal decision.
19. I have imposed a condition on the planning permission and the listed building consent requiring the details of the external materials to be approved. This is necessary to safeguard the significance of the listed building. For the same reason, I have imposed a condition on the listed building consent that requires any works of making good to the historic fabric to match the adjacent fabric.
20. The Council's suggested condition for a biodiversity improvement scheme would be disproportionate given the small-scale of the proposal and the limited opportunities available to create, restore, enhance, and connect natural habitats as an integral part of the scheme. Therefore, I have not imposed this suggested condition because it would be unnecessary and unreasonable.
21. I have not included a condition that seeks to prohibit contractor parking on the public highway. Such a condition would be unnecessary because the appeal property has a large driveway area with sufficient space for contractors to park. Moreover, there are mechanisms available to the Council outside of the planning process through which matters related to the public highway can be enforced.

Conclusion

22. For the reasons given above, Appeal A and Appeal B should be allowed.

E Catchside
INSPECTOR