

**UTT/18/3525/LB - TAKELEY**

(Referred to Committee as accompanied by a planning application for more than 5 dwellings)

**PROPOSAL:** Demolition of extensions to the listed building and its retention as a single dwelling.

**LOCATION:** Frogs Hall, Bambers Green Road, Takeley

**APPLICANT:** Winston Group

**AGENT:** DLA Town Planning Ltd

**EXPIRY DATE:** 27<sup>th</sup> February 2019 (extension of time until 17<sup>th</sup> January 2020)

**CASE OFFICER:** Jonathan Doe

---

**1. NOTATION**

1.1 Grade II Listed Building

**2. DESCRIPTION OF SITE**

2.1 The site is that of a detached house and its curtilage. The house is on the western side of Bambers Green Road.

2.2 Within the curtilage of the house is an outhouse known as the Coach House.

**3. PROPOSAL**

3.1 Demolition of extensions to the listed building and its retention as a single dwelling.

3.2 The proposals involve the retention of a single dwelling within the listed building, the formation of an annex within the retained and restored Coach House. The coach House would be retained as an Annex to Frog's Hall, proposals for this restoration will come forward under a separate application.

**4. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

4.1 Town and Country Planning (Environmental Assessment):  
The proposal is not a Schedule 1 development, nor does it exceed the threshold criteria of Schedule 2, and therefore an Environmental Assessment is not required.

**5. APPLICANT'S CASE**

5.1 The application documentation includes a Heritage Statement and a Planning Statement.

5.2 A case is made that the site comprises previously developed land and as such its development is encouraged by the NPPF. The previous use of the land is said to

be a use that would fall within Class B2/B8. The historic use of the site has no restriction on such matters as hours of operation or open storage. Existing commercial buildings would be demolished. At paragraph 6.2.2 of the Planning Statement it is stated that buildings with a footprint of 994 sq m and a volume of 4,196 cubic metres would be demolished.

- 5.3 A process of heritage assessment has concluded that that the proposals result in beneficial impacts on both the fabric of the listed building and also in terms of its setting.

## **6. RELEVANT SITE HISTORY**

- 6.1 No relevant history.

## **7. POLICIES**

### **Uttlesford Local Plan (2005)**

ENV2 – Development affecting Listed Buildings

### **Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance**

None.

### **National Policies**

National Planning Policy Framework

### **Other Material Considerations**

None.

## **8. PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS**

- 8.1 Takeley Parish Council object to this application for the following reasons:
1. In the curtilage of a listed building in a Countryside Protection Zone. Not in keeping with the current area.
  2. Overdevelopment of site with six houses crammed on a minor road.

## **9. CONSULTATIONS**

### **Specialist Advice on Historic Buildings and Conservation**

- 9.1 The application is for the demolition of extensions to the listed building and its retention as a single dwelling, demolition of existing outbuildings and the erection of 6 no. detached dwellings.
- 9.2 The above concerns Frogs Hall, a Grade II listed (HE Ref: 1112188) house.
- 9.3 The list description notes:  
House. Circa early C17, extended in C18 and early C19 and remodelled in circa mid C19. Rendered and partly slate hung timber frame and white- washed brick. Slate roof with gabled ends and crested ridge tiles; wings at rear, with hipped slate roof and gable-ended plain tile roof. Brick gable-end and lateral stacks. Plan: circa early C17 front (east) range extended by addition of C18 wing at rear of right end

(north west), and in early C19 by wing at rear of left end (south west). In circa mid C19 the house was remodelled.

- 9.4 Two storeys. Almost symmetrical three-bay east front. Central glazed door with tented canopy, canted bay of sashes with glazing bars to left and right, above which the first floor is jettied out and gabled with ornate bargeboards. C19 three-light moulded mullion transom. Windows on first floor (centre two-lights) all with hood moulds. Left hand (south) return, hipped wing on left with large French casement and C19 12-pane sash above, and lean-to verandah on right with brick piers and French casement. Right hand (north) return, C18 wing, three-window range, with circa C18 three-light wooden mullion windows with leaded casements and flush-panel door; lower C19 stable range to right (north west). Various sash windows and outshuts at rear.
- 9.5 Interior: largely result of circa mid C19 remodelling with joinery mostly of that period. Many C18 fielded six-panel doors. Late C19 staircase. Chimneypieces replaced. Rear north west kitchen wing has one chamfered cross-beam with runout stops.
- 9.6 Five bays of the circa early C17 roof over the front (east) range survive; trusses have lapped dovetail jointed collars, clasped side purlins, curved wind braces; heavy stud partition (closed truss) between bays three and four; some common rafters survive. Roof over C18 rear wing of softwood, collars mortice and tenoned to principal rafters and clasping side purlins, the common rafters largely intact and no ridge piece.
- 9.7 Whilst I have no objection in principle to the proposed demolition of the modern outbuildings and the modern extension to Frogs Hall, the proposed development of the site is considered detrimental to the understanding of Frogs Hall as a historic hall house: a high status building enclosed by ample amenity space. Development to the rear of Frogs Hall has traditionally comprised of buildings associated with the host dwelling, clustered around the north extent of the application site and it is recommended that this be retained, facilitating the appreciation of Frogs Hall's historic rank. Further to this, the proposed scheme would lead to the overdevelopment of the plot and the saturation of a listed building's setting with built form, curtailing its curtilage and at odds with the traditionally open character of the building's surrounds.
- 9.8 For the above, the scheme is considered to cause "less than substantial harm" to a designated heritage asset and paragraph 196 of the NPPF is relevant.

## **10. REPRESENTATIONS**

- 10.1 This application has been advertised by a site notice posted on 29 January and letters were sent to neighbouring properties on 23 January. The notification period expired on 19 February 2019. No representation has been received.

## **11. APPRAISAL**

The issue to consider in the determination of the application is:

- A Whether the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the character and setting of a Listed Building.

**A Whether the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the character and setting of a Listed Building.**

- 11.1 The listed building itself would be retained as a single dwelling. The removal of later additions and the enhancement of the immediate setting will result in the creation of an attractive dwelling which will be more manageable on its reduced footprint, and closer to its original size and character.
- 11.2 The proposals involve the removal of a large amount of added extension at the rear of the existing listed building. These additions have been added piecemeal over previous decades and they do not possess historic or architectural interest. Removing them will better reveal the special interest of the principal building and enable its immediate setting to be opened up to create a more attractive context.
- 11.3 Specialist advice is that the scheme is considered to cause “less than substantial harm” to the significance of a heritage asset and paragraph 196 of the NPPF is relevant.
- 11.4 The NPPF requires a balance to be applied in the context of heritage assets, including the recognition of potential benefits accruing from a development. In the case of proposals which would result in “less than substantial harm”, paragraph 196 provides the following:  
  
“Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.”
- 11.5 Whilst the misgivings of the specialist advisor are noted, the specialist advice concludes that the proposals are considered to cause less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset and as such paragraph 196 of the NPPF is relevant. This paragraph refers to any harm being weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. A residential use as a property of a manageable size would ensure that the building would be maintained in a good condition and that it would ensure the long term retention and preservation of the form of the original house.
- 11.6 At the time of the site visit the house was vacant. The house appeared to have been closely associated with the business use involving the former agricultural buildings which latterly had a commercial use. It is considered that the proposals, involving the house reverting to a family type property of a manageable scale would avoid the house remaining vacant and declining further in terms of its maintenance.
- 11.7 The proposal is considered to be acceptable with regard to Policy ENV2.

**12. CONCLUSION**

The following is a summary of the main reasons for the recommendation:

- A** It noted that specialist advice does not go so far as to recommend refusal and taking the proposal in a broad context it is considered that the balance of benefits against dis-benefits is such that Listed Building consent should be given.

## RECOMMENDATION – LISTED BUILDING CONSENT WITH CONDITIONS

### Conditions

1. The development to which this consent relates shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this decision.

REASON: To comply with the requirements of Section 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Uttlesford Council, Licence No. 100018688 (2018)

