

Appeal 6004276

Appellant's final comments

Appeal type	Planning listed building and conservation area
Appeal procedure	Written
Appeal site	Lutyens Cottage, Hitchwood Lane, Preston, SG47RY
Appellant contact details	Matthew Pyne-Madden mattypgee@gmail.com 07900934269
Local planning authority	North Hertfordshire
Application number	25/02318/LBC

Final comments	We welcome the final written submissions provided by The Lutyens Trust. Their reaffirmed support for the scheme strikes at the very heart of the Council’s reasons for refusal and underscores why this appeal should be allowed. We respectfully ask the Inspector to consider the following points regarding the weight of this expert testimony: 1. Unrivaled Specialist Expertise vs. Generalist Opinion The Lutyens Trust is the preeminent, national authority dedicated exclusively to the study, preservation, and understanding of Sir Edwin Lutyens's architectural legacy. While a Local Authority Conservation Officer serves a vital role as a generalist overseeing a broad spectrum of local heritage assets, they cannot reasonably claim to possess a deeper understanding of Lutyens's specific design philosophy than the Trust itself. Where a subjective aesthetic objection from a local officer directly contradicts the unequivocal endorsement of the dedicated national specialist body for that exact architect, the specialist consensus must be given overriding weight. 2. A Vetted, Collaborative Design The Trust’s comments confirm that this proposal is not a speculative or careless intervention. They note that they were consulted "at an early stage and throughout the design process" and that the submitted scheme directly "responds to our [the Trust's] suggestions". The Inspector is therefore assessing a design that has been iteratively refined and vetted by the foremost experts on the building's architect. 3. Unequivocal Support on "Legibility" and "Character" The Council's primary reason for refusal hinges on the claim that the link is "incongruous" and impairs the relationship between the buildings. The Lutyens Trust explicitly rejects this premise. Their final submission confirms: * "The scheme would not compromise the special historic character and interest of the buildings." * The proposal successfully "brings the outbuilding into full beneficial use whilst retaining the legibility of the original form." This directly dismantles the Conservation Officer's subjective assertion that the physical and visual relationship of the buildings would be harmed. 4. Understanding Lutyens's Intent (The Courtyard Window) Perhaps most tellingly, the Trust's comments expose the rigid and flawed interpretation applied by the local officer regarding the disputed courtyard window. While the Council viewed it as an unjustified intervention, the Trust confirms they have "no objection, whether with or without a window". Crucially, the Trust notes that a narrow, off-centre window would afford useful supervision (functionality) and be "entirely consistent with Lutyens's delight in architectural jokes". This demonstrates the Trust’s profound, nuanced understanding of how Lutyens actually designed his buildings—an
----------------	---

understanding completely missed in the Council’s rigid, generalist assessment. Conclusion. However, we are happy to concede on this point and omit it from the scheme if necessary.

The national experts on Sir Edwin Lutyens have definitively stated that this collaboratively designed scheme preserves the special historic character of the asset, retains its legibility, and brings it into beneficial use. The Council’s refusal relies entirely on a single officer's subjective preference that runs wholly contrary to this expert consensus.

We respectfully urge the Inspector to place the appropriate weight on the findings of The Lutyens Trust and allow the appeal. [Close](#)

Supporting documents	No documents
----------------------	--------------
