



---

## Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 12 November 2025

**by Jennifer Wallace BA(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 4th March 2026**

---

### **Appeal A Ref: APP/D3505/W/25/3368185**

#### **Maltings Lodge, The Street, Chelsworth, Suffolk IP7 7HU**

- 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 Partridge against the decision of Babergh District Council.
  - The application Ref is DC/25/00874.
  - The development proposed is extension and alteration of Maltings Lodge and the replacement of a double bay cart lodge.
- 

### **Appeal B Ref: APP/D3505/Y/25/3368180**

#### **Maltings Lodge, The Street, Chelsworth, Suffolk IP7 7HU**

- 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 Partridge against the decision of Babergh District Council.
  - The application Ref is DC/25/00875.
  - The works proposed are extension and alteration of Maltings Lodge and the replacement of a double bay cart lodge.
- 

## **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. While the official list entry refers to Church Farmhouse, I have referred to the listed building as Barrards throughout this decision letter as this is the name most commonly used in the evidence before me.
5. It is common ground between the parties that Maltings Lodge is 'curtilage listed' and by virtue of s1(5)(b) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), Maltings Lodge should be 'treated as part of' the Grade II listed building known as Barrards. I have no reason to disagree and have determined the appeals on this basis. While Maltings Lodge itself lies within the Chelsworth Conservation Area (CA), the existing garage and much of land where the extension is proposed lies outside the CA.
6. Consequently, in determining the appeals I have had regard to the relevant statutory duties set out in sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Act. These 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. For the avoidance of doubt, only that part of the proposal sited within the CA is subject to the requirements of s72(1) of the Act, while all of the proposal, whether located within the CA or its setting, is subject to the provisions within the Framework concerning designated heritage assets.

## **Main Issue**

7. The main issue for both appeals is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the significance of the Grade II listed building known as Barrards; and the character, appearance and significance of the Chelsworth Conservation Area.

## **Reasons**

### *Special Interest and Significance*

8. Barrards<sup>1</sup> is an early 19th century painted brick building. Its special interest and therefore significance are derived from its architectural interest as a vernacular dwelling and its historic interest as to changing patterns of occupation and use of land associated with it.
9. Pertinent to these appeals, its setting including its walled garden and the immediately surrounding land, also contributes in part to the asset's heritage merit. The evidence before me includes a photograph of Maltings Lodge from circa 1860 and sales particulars from the 1878 sale of Barrards which also indicate a carriage yard and stabling development. Maltings Lodge is a surviving example of a well-designed mid-19th century stable block and carriage house for a private house and illustrates changing social aspirations as demonstrated through the development of supporting buildings. It is a modest property with a simple linear form which uses traditional materials which echo Barrards. It therefore has historic, physical and functional associations with Barrards and contributes in a positive and meaningful way to its special interest. This is despite the properties no longer being in the same ownership and the erection of a dividing wall.
10. The appeal site lies partially within the Chelsworth Conservation Area (CA), with the location of the proposed extension lying largely outwith the designation. Its character and appearance are mainly derived from its historic interest as a rural settlement with associations to the cloth industry in Suffolk and patterns of occupation through time. It also has architectural interest arising from the quality of its historic buildings and use of traditional materials, with dwellings generally being timber framed, or painted brick. Its setting comprises of the surrounding agricultural landscape which allows the historic settlement pattern to be appreciated. Barrards and consequently Maltings Lodge contribute to this as fine examples of residential, and associated development and land use patterns in Chelsworth.

### *Appeal Proposal and Effects*

11. The proposal includes a single storey L-shaped extension to the north of Maltings Lodge. This would require the removal of a modern extension and the existing garage. The perpendicular projection would be comprised of two distinct aspects:

---

<sup>1</sup> List Entry Number: 1194117 Date first listed: 10 July 1980

a flat roof single storey connecting link that would wrap around part of the exterior of the extension and a central, pitched roof section. Parallel to the existing dwelling would be a further pitch-roofed extension, set in slightly from the end of the perpendicular extension. The elevations would be finished in a combination of brick and wooden panelling, with some expansive areas of glazing. The roof would be in zinc, other than one section which would utilise photo-voltaic (PV) panels.

12. Maltings Lodge has largely retained the simple, rectangular layout indicated in the earliest evidence of its presence. The modern extensions generally continued this layout and are modest alterations to the plan form. Maltings Lodge is described as appearing to 'nestle' within the site and from my observations at my site visit, I agree.
13. The proposal is for an extension and must be assessed as such. It would alter the existing simple layout to a more complex courtyard arrangement. It would be notably larger than the existing property. The narrow glazed link and proportions of the individual components of the proposed extension would not minimise the perception of the scale of the alterations. Consequently, Maltings Lodge would be changed from a modest dwelling to a substantial one. This would harm the appreciation of the historic form and layout which allows its former use to be understood. It would also fundamentally undermine the ability to appreciate the historic relationship between Barrards and Maltings Lodge as its stable/ carriage yard.
14. The proposed extension would project well beyond the walled garden into the surrounding countryside. This would serve to further undermine the ability to appreciate the historic relationship between the buildings, particularly in views from the public right of way. It would also undermine the nestled position of Maltings Lodge which reinforces its subservient relationship to Barrards. This is despite the lower level of the land on which the extension would be sited.
15. The proposed extension would be of a somewhat convoluted design, with three distinctive elements involving different materials, patterns of fenestration and roof form generally different to those of the host property. When combined with the scale of the extension, the proposal would not result in a coherent form of development which respects the scale, mass and appearance of the host property.
16. It is clear from the evidence before me that historically there have been other buildings related to the use of the site in proximity to Maltings Lodge. However, this proposal would be clearly perceived as an extension to the property and so would not evoke the previous barn on the site in a meaningful fashion. Nor would the use of weatherboard help the proposal be perceived as such.
17. The extension would be sited away from Barrards and would not affect the southern courtyard which was historically the functional area for the use of the stable. Listed buildings are protected for their inherent value, and a lack of inter-visibility would not justify the proposal in light of the harms I have identified.
18. The position of the proposed extension, projecting into the garden area, would be an incremental progression of the built form into the countryside beyond that of the existing garage. However, the land immediately to the north of the site has a manicured appearance which clearly distinguishes it from the adjacent agricultural fields. It is also framed by Millstone Cottage. As a result, the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As development within

the setting of the CA, nor would the extension diminish the ability to appreciate the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset.

19. There would only be a very small proportion of the proposed extension within the CA. There would also be a cart-lodge which would lie approximately to the west of Maltings Lodge. This would be predominantly timber boarded with a slate roof and an open front. The map regressions and photograph contained in the appellants' evidence indicate various outbuildings around the site over its history. The proposed cart-lodge, due to its limited scale and position, would have a neutral effect on the ability to appreciate the special interest of Barrards and Maltings Lodge as part of it. Both the cart-lodge and the part of the extension within the CA would have a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the CA as a whole due to their scale and location.
20. Internal and external alterations to Maltings Lodge are also proposed, including the reinstatement of the historic position of the front door. The internal alterations would involve alterations and removal of works carried out when the property was converted. These aspects of the proposal would have a neutral effect on, and so would preserve the special interest of the heritage asset.
21. The proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character, appearance and significance of the CA. This would be in accordance with s72(1) of the Act and the provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment. It would also be in accordance with Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan 2023 (LP) Policies SP09 and LP19 which taken together require the special interest of heritage assets to be safeguarded and for development to consider the historic environment. A lack of harm in this regard weighs neither for nor against the appeals.
22. However, I find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building Barrards. This would be contrary to the requirements of sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Act.

### *Public Benefits and Balance*

23. Paragraph 212 of 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.
24. I find that the harm to the significance of Barrards would be less than substantial and at the mid-point of that range. Nevertheless, this harm carries 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.
25. 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. There would be a social benefit from the provision of a dwelling which would provide accessible and adaptable facilities. However, there is no mechanism before me to ensure the dwelling would be occupied by a person who would require such provision. Consequently, this would also only be of limited public benefit. The proposal would include PV panels which would be an environmental and so public

benefit of the proposal. There is no substantive evidence before me that the method and materials of construction would be such that there would be additional environmental benefits.

26. There would be a heritage benefit from the reinstatement of the door to the southern elevation and removal of the internal partitions, floor and alterations which would allow the original expansive form of the interior to be appreciated. The removal of the modern extension and the garage would also constitute a heritage benefit. In particular, the removal of the garage would allow the boundary wall to Barrards and the relationship between Barrards and Maltings Lodge to be better appreciated and so would better reveal the significance of the listed building. However, the benefits arising from these aspects of the proposal and the weight they would carry would be undermined by the proposed extension for the reasons I have given above. The removal of trellising and planting in the south courtyard would be neutral as the historic fabric of the building can still be appreciated with it in place.
27. 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. Much of the rear elevation that would be visible through the glazed link would be the opening in the wall. The proposal would therefore not lead to an ability to appreciate historic fabric that would constitute a benefit of the proposal. Nor is there any merit in assessing the effect of the glazed extension in isolation of the rest of the proposal.
28. 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 limited public benefits arising from the proposal.
29. The proposed development and works would have a harmful effect on the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building Barrards. This would be contrary to the requirements of sections 16(2) and 66(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 LP Policies SP09 and LP19 which taken together require the special interest of heritage assets to be safeguarded and for development to consider the historic environment.

### **Other Matters**

30. The Heritage Impact Assessment identified a number of other designated heritage assets nearby. Princhetts and The Old Forge are both Grade II\* listed buildings, with Middle House The Old Manor and Chestnut Cottages both being listed at Grade II. The significance of these buildings is mainly derived from their architectural and historic interest in the development of the area as vernacular buildings. Pertinent to Appeal A, their significance also stems in part from their settings which extend to and along The Street as the streetscape allows the historic development of the properties to be better appreciated. Given the position of the proposal away from The Street, the settings of these listed buildings would be preserved and their significance as designated heritage assets would not be harmed. I note the Council had no concerns in this regard either.
31. I have been directed to other schemes and advice on designing appropriate extensions in areas with heritage significance. However, any assessment is specific to each building and each proposal. The fact large extensions have been allowed to other properties would not alter my assessment of the effects of this

proposal. Proposals which were not subject to the statutory duties imposed by the Act with respect to listed buildings would not be comparable to the scheme before me. While it may be that there are examples of supporting structures elsewhere in Suffolk that are U shaped, that is not the form of development within the site I am considering.

32. The Heritage Impact Assessment accepted that Maltings Lodge was a curtilage listed building. The general principles for the selection of designated heritage assets would therefore not be of any relevance to the assessment of the proposal.
33. The appellants have sought appropriate professional advice in the preparation and submission of the applications and appeals. I acknowledge their long family connection to the property, the wider area and their wish to retire to this property. I also acknowledge there is support for the proposal from many in the community. However, these do not change my assessment of the effects of the proposal on the special interest and significance of Barrards.
34. While I note the Council has cited conflict with LP Policies SP03 and LP03, this is only in relation to the design of the proposal. From my observations at my site visit, I have no reason to find further conflict with these policies with respect to the position of the proposed extension relative to the settlement boundary. The proposed cart-lodge would be well within the settlement limit and so would not be contrary to the principle of those policies insofar as they seek to direct the location of development.
35. No adverse effects on protected species were identified and so this would be neutral in my assessment. I do not have full details of the pre-application advice provided to the appellants and I acknowledge the appellants engaged with the heritage comments provided by the Council. However I have reached my own conclusions on the proposal before me. Matters concerning how the Council made its decision are not within the remit of these appeals.

## Conclusions

36. 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.
37. Appeal B: For the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal B should be dismissed.

*Jennifer Wallace*

INSPECTOR