

DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Mark Simmons.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
26/00588/LBC	Total demolition of C17 or C18 grade II listed barn following accidental partial collapse (development already carried out)	Rooks Nest Farm Rooks Nest Lane Therfield Hertfordshire SG8 9QX

Submitted Plan Nos

Site Location Plan 0450-1 Existing Plans

1.0 Policies

HE1	Designated heritage assets
SECN16	Conserve + enhance historic environment

2.0 Site History

2.1 Relevant planning history provided below:

11/01750/1HH - Renovation and conversion of existing barn to habitable area and erection of single storey link from main house.
CP 30.09.2011

11/01751/1LB - Renovation and conversion of existing barn to habitable area. Insertion of new windows to front and side elevations and insertion of two rooflights to rear elevation. Installation of mezzanine floor and erection of single storey link from main house following part demolition of existing side store.
CCON 30.09.2011

21/00487/GEN - Grade II listed barn damaged by falling tree.
Conservation Officer response 23.02.2021

25/00509/FPH - Renovation and conversion of existing barn into habitable accommodation, to include insertion of windows to front and side elevations, insertion of two rooflights in rear elevation and repair or replace existing cart doors. Installation of mezzanine floor, and erection of single storey glazed extension to link to main dwelling, following part demolition of existing side store.
CP 25.06.2025

25/00510/LBC - Renovation and conversion of existing barn into habitable accommodation, to include insertion of windows to front and side elevations, insertion of two rooflights in rear elevation and repair or replace existing cart doors. Installation of mezzanine floor, and erection of single storey glazed extension to link to main dwelling, following part demolition of existing side store.

CCON 25.06.2025

3.0 **Policies**

3.1 Policy HE1 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011 – 2031 is relevant as are the following paragraphs of Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Dec 2024):

- 1.0 **135 c)** (*sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment*),
- 2.0 **207** (*local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting*)
- 3.0 **210** (*desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness*),
- 4.0 **212** (*great weight should be given to the asset's conservation*),
- 5.0 **213** (*clear and convincing justification*), and
- 6.0 **215** (*harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use*).

4.0 **Representations**

4.1 **Therfield Parish Council** – No comments received.

Historic England – See response below.

The application describes how dismantling of the barn into its component elements of timber frame was carried out with the agreement of the conservation officer. It is unclear from the application how much of the frame remains or its condition and therefore how practical a reconstruction might be, but we are content to leave an assessment of this to the Council along with determination. We refer you to the following published advice which you may find helpful in determining the application and which relates to listed building consent and the conservation of historic significance:

Listed Building Consent (Historic England Advice Note 16)
<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/listed-building-consent-advice-note-16/heag304-listed-building-consent/>

Making Changes to Heritage Assets (Historic England Advice Note 2)
<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/making-changes-heritage-assets-advice-note-2/heag023-making-changes-to-heritage-assets/>

Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (Good Practice Advice in Planning: 2) <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa2-managing-significance-in-decision-taking/gpa2/>

The Adaptive Reuse of Traditional Farm Buildings (Historic England Advice Note 9, 2017) <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/adaptive-reuse-traditional-farm-buildings-advice-note-9/heag156-adaptive-reuse-farm-buildings/>

National Amenities Societies –

Response received from **Historic Building & Places (HB&P)** – see below.

Thank you for notifying HB&P of the above application. Based on the information submitted, it isn't clear what remains, how much of the barn was lost due to asbestos contamination, and if the barn can be reinstated. However, given Council's Conservation Officer has been involved at the time of the collapse, we will defer to their advice on this occasion.

If Council does issue consent for permanent demolition, the applicant is requested to submit an application to Historic England to delist the barn as soon as practical to ensure the NHLE is updated.

Response received from **Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB)** – see below (my emphasis underlined).

Thank you for notifying the SPAB of the above application affecting this 17th century Grade II listed building. Having carefully reviewed the submission, we offer the following observations. It is concerning that the early timber framed barn has been demolished in its entirety and without listed building consent. This action/demolition has resulted in the total loss of a designated heritage asset and its significance. As it is not possible to grant retrospective Listed Building Consent, the application must be assessed as if the demolition had not yet occurred and as per the requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

No clear explanation has been provided for the building's reported accidental collapse. The application describes the barn as "dilapidated", though it is unclear whether this refers to its pre collapse condition. The 2021 structural survey concluded that the barn was structurally sound and capable of conversion without strengthening, yet no evidence has been submitted to show how and why its condition deteriorated so significantly by 2025. There is also no information to demonstrate what action(s) may have been taken to halt deterioration and prevent/avoid collapse. Without this information, it is not possible to establish whether the loss was unavoidable.

Additionally, the application contains no information confirming whether any steps were taken after the collapse to stabilise what remained and prevent any further losses, e.g. propping, shoring, temporary protection of surviving fabric. It is also not clear why the complete removal of all historic fabric, including the brick plinth and timber frame has been undertaken. And why a small number of timbers have been retained in storage, no explanation is given for their selection or why other surviving elements were not protected.

The supporting letter states that the urgent demolition was required owing to a health and safety risk arising from asbestos and the fire hazard posed by ivy. However:

- 1.0 both asbestos and ivy were present for many years without being treated as emergencies.*
- 2.0 no evidence has been submitted demonstrating that they suddenly presented an immediate, unmanageable risk; and*
- 3.0 no specialist advice has been provided indicating that demolition was the only safe response.*

If the ivy was considered a fire or safety hazard, it is unclear why it was allowed to grow unchecked to such an extent. Long standing unmanaged vegetation generally indicates a lack of routine maintenance, and any risk arising from such neglect cannot reasonably be used to justify demolition in accordance with NPPF paragraph 209.

The email from the Conservation Officer following their site visit of 3 December stated that listed building consent would be required for complete demolition. They also advised that retrieval of roof materials should be undertaken carefully to avoid unnecessary damage to the historic frame, that the remaining structure should be protected, and that a photographic record of the asbestos removal should be produced. There is no evidence that any of this advice was followed. The application therefore does not demonstrate that the advice of the local authority was heeded and that any steps were taken to halt/slow/prevent further deterioration, or that collapse was inevitable and unavoidable, and that demolition was necessary or the only solution.

In conclusion, we advise that the application does not provide the requisite clear and convincing justification for the total loss of the designated heritage asset/significance, and that there are no public benefits that outweigh that total loss (as per NPPF paragraph 214 a)-d). The application therefore fails to meet the requirements of Chapter 16 of the NPPF, in particular' paragraphs 212–214:

212. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

213. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.

214. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to, or total loss of significance of, a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.

In summary, the retrospective application does not demonstrate compliance with national policy. The reasons given—particularly the presence of ivy and asbestos—do not justify the total loss of the structure, nor has any evidence been provided to prove, as a defence, that the works were necessary as per Section 9 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 in respect of offences and unauthorised work:

Section 9(3) — It shall be a defence to prove that:

(a) the works were urgently necessary in the interests of safety or health or for the preservation of the building;

(b) it was not practicable to secure safety or health, or the preservation of the building, by repair or temporary support/shelter;

(c) the works were limited to the minimum measures immediately necessary; and

(d) written notice justifying the works was given to the local planning authority as soon as reasonably practicable.

Press & site notices – No representations received.

5.0 **Planning Considerations**

5.1 **Site & Surroundings**

- 5.1.1 Rooks Nest Farmhouse and barn about 5 metres east of Rooks Nest Farmhouse are two separately grade II listed buildings and are Designated Heritage Assets for the purpose of applying the aims of Section 16 of the NPPF. The list entries can be found at the following links:

<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1307694?section=official-list-entry>

<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1347390?section=official-list-entry>

5.2 **Proposal**

- 5.2.1 The works are described as: ***Total demolition of C17 or C18 grade II listed barn following accidental partial collapse (development already carried out).***

5.3 **Key Issues**

- 5.3.1 The key issue is that this grade II listed building has been totally demolished following correspondence with the Local Planning Authority and officer advice. It goes without

saying that the listed building's special character has been irrevocably lost and a decision is required as to whether to grant listed building consent for what has taken place.

- 5.3.2 A structural report prepared by Philip Harvey Associates Ltd (Nov 2010) was submitted under refs: 11/01750/1HH and 11/01751/1LB and I highlight the following:

Gridline D Gable

- 2.0 Post D3 **will require surgery** to the lower 300mm section, where it has rotted away due to rainwater saturation.
- 3.0 The **front wall panel has displaced outwards** historically due to settlement of the front wall foundations. The present tie bars and straps have been introduced to try and arrest further movement.

Bays C - D

- 4.0 There has been **severe vertical and outward displacement of the brickwork plinth wall**. The foundations are extremely shallow and the wall is fractured in two places along its length as a result of localised settlement.

Frame on Gridline C

- 5.0 The frame on Gridline C has **displaced towards the front elevation** by up to 150mm, as a result of the settlement of the foundations to bay C to D. It should be possible to pull the distorted frame back into vertical alignment following the recommended underpinning works, before repair and strengthening is carried out.
- 6.0 The **missing knee-brace adjacent the front elevation will need to be replaced** using existing mortices and pegged into position. The knee brace is presently on the floor of the barn.

Bay B - C

- 7.0 The **rotation of the frame towards the front** has caused the studs on gridline 1 to fracture at the tenon joints. Some rot deterioration at the base is also evident due to the high external ground level.

Frame on Gridline B

- 8.0 This timber frame is in reasonable condition. However, **a horizontal fracture to the principal tie** will need to be repaired with resin injection at the knee brace junction.

Bay A – B

- 9.0 The **purlin on the rear slope is completely severed and dangerous**. This is a previous use member with multiple mortice voids, which is wholly inadequate for its current purpose.

CONCLUSION

Generally, the defects noted during the inspection are the result of age and weather deterioration, which do not significantly affect the overall structural integrity of the building and could be easily repaired and strengthened, as detailed in the body of this report. The survey has been carried out in accordance with Clause 4.10, Section 4 of Approved Document A1/2, which requires a detailed Structural Inspection to be carried out in accordance with the guidance given in BRE 366 Structural Appraisal of existing buildings for change of use. The barn structures are considered to be of permanent and substantial construction and would be suitable for conversion to other uses, without the necessity for further strengthening or alteration. Indeed, the introduction of additional walls and floors within the barn structure would provide additional lateral rigidity.

5.3.3 It is noted that application refs: 11/01750/1HH & 11/01751/1LB were not implemented due to financial constraints.

5.3.4 A Preliminary Inspection Report [PIR] was prepared by Benet Consulting Limited (Jan 2021) under ref: **21/00487/GEN**. This was following the barn suffering extensive damage from a large part of a Willow tree breaking off on **26 December 2020** when Hertfordshire experienced severe weather associated with Storm Bella, which brought heavy rain and strong winds to the region. The PIR confirmed the following:

10.0 The right-hand half of the structure has been damaged; the asbestos roof sheeting has been broken where impacted by the falling branch as has the main purlin and part of the roof framing.

11.0 There is distortion evident in the main frame and there is evidence to suggest that the tree impact has caused additional distortion with there now being a quite severe out of vertical leaning out to the front.

12.0 The lower part of the wall to the midstretey is under significant stress.

13.0 The broken purlin and damaged eaves beam mean the east gable is partially unrestrained.

5.3.5 On 23 March 2020 the UK entered its first coronavirus lockdown. Storm Bella occurred during the second UK coronavirus lockdown (commenced 5 November and was due to end on 26 November 2020). A third lockdown was imposed on 4 January 2021 and on 22 February 2021 a roadmap was published for lifting the lockdown.

5.3.6 On **23 February 2021** I issued the following email to the owner.

..... I note in your original email that the barn has been quite seriously damaged when a large part of the nearby mature willow tree broke off and fell on the right hand half of the roof. I note that temporary propping has been arranged to be installed to minimise the risk of further collapse of the building. I note that the willow tree is now very unbalanced. Acknowledging that it would be safer to remove it, I confirm that the tree does not appear to be the subject of a TPO and the property is also not in the Therfield Conservation Area, therefore, no consent is required to fell this tree.

Previously, I was involved with application refs: 11/00282/1HH & 11/00283/1LB (both withdrawn) then with application refs: 11/01750/1HH and 11/01751/1LB for 'Renovation and conversion of existing barn to habitable area. Insertion of new windows to front and side elevations and insertion of two rooflights to rear elevation. Installation of mezzanine floor and erection of single storey link from main house following part demolition of existing side store' (not implemented). At the time, I stated that "... whilst the barn is not on the Council's Buildings at Risk Register (2003), it is in a rather parlous state with extensive invasive plant growth. The present condition and future long term use of this barn is a concern to the Conservation Team and the team positively encourages a long-term viable use".

I note that your client needs to proceed with the asbestos removal, part demolition of the damaged section and replacement timbers, roofing etc and you have enquired as to whether the owners can proceed without my/LPA input?

The key question here is whether the works constitute alterations affecting the building's special character or are repairs not requiring consent.

Some further indication as to the precise extent of works necessary would be useful as the two photos are insufficient. I am also unable to attend site during the current Covid-19 restrictions. My main concerns are i) any further destabilising of the existing structure that may be caused by the existing damaged section; ii) if the roof covering is removed and no temporary roof covering

installed, the impact upon the timber frame if exposed to the elements; and iii) what is the proposed new roof finish?

A Structural Inspection Report (Report No. 4698/001) was prepared for Mr & Mrs J Williams by Philip Harvey Associates Ltd in November 2010 and at the time provided a sound basis for progressing works to the frame. Things have clearly moved on since then. In the first instance, I would like to see some indicative plan/elevations of the extent of damage. The Design and Access Statement submitted in 2011 included the following photo indicating that the timbers at the right-hand gable end are quite modern. If this is the section that was damaged, I encourage the reintroduction of an oak frame to this end of the building. The DAS stated that the roof "will consist of entirely new rafters..." . On the basis that the 2011 scheme was not implemented means that the consent in place at that time for a new roof structure, new openings and reclaimed handmade clay plain tile roof, has lapsed. If the current works, therefore, proceed beyond that of repairing the frame and include a new roof structure and clay tile finish and perhaps even making the building 'conversion ready', for instance, a new floor as well, then this will technically, in my opinion, require a fresh LBC application.

- 5.3.7 On **3 December 2025** I attended site having been notified by the owner that the barn had collapsed. On **5 December** I emailed the owner referencing photos that were included as part of an undated Design and Heritage Statement submitted with application refs: 25/00509/FPH & 25/00510/LBC which were granted planning permission and listed building consent respectively on 25 June 2025. A covering letter with the current application confirms that the barn suffered an accidental partial collapse on **23 November 2025**.
- 5.3.8 Even if measures had been put in place pre-pandemic the impact of Storm Bella on the listed building were not foreseen and notwithstanding the recommendations in Benet Consulting Limited's PIR (Jan 2021) it was a challenging period in which to instigate either a schedule of repairs or for the LPA to have potentially served an Urgent Works Notice. It was also anticipated, that prior to being notified that the building had collapsed in December 2025, that the owner would have commenced the implementation of refs: 25/00509/FPH & 25/00510/LBC.
- 5.3.9 In my 5 December 2025 email, I went on to say that works may sometimes have to be carried out to a listed building as a matter of urgency, either by way of emergency repairs or to forestall imminent collapse. This might involve the demolition of a whole building which is suddenly found to be unsafe. Wherever possible, listed building consent should be obtained, or at least applied for, in advance. In some cases, however, the urgency may be such that it is not practical to obtain authorisation in advance. It will then be necessary to obtain Listed Building Consent to retain the works which have already been carried out. In all cases, unless it is absolutely certain that Listed Building Consent is not required at all, written notice (even if not a formal application for consent) must be given to the local planning authority "as soon as reasonably practicable", either before or after works, to avoid any possible liability to criminal prosecution for carrying out works without consent. Such notice must justify in detail why the works are being or were carried out, and in particular, must explain:
- 1.0 that they were urgently necessary in the interests of safety or health or for the preservation of the building;
 - 2.0 that the same result could not be achieved by repair works or temporary support or shelter; and
 - 3.0 that the works were limited to the minimum measures immediately necessary.
- 5.3.10 I went on to advise that:

Listed Building Consent is probably not required for accidental damage. Following such an accident, sometimes it may be necessary to carry out further works to render safe what

remains, even, in some cases, to the extent of completely demolishing the building. This appears to be the case here. Such further works, if they are in truth urgently necessary, would be covered by the above provision. Normally, the advice is that as well as notifying the authority it would be appropriate to record (with photographs) the condition of the building after the initial damage and before further works, to avoid any subsequent suggestion of impropriety. Officer photos below give us comparative images before and after the collapse.

You have stated that sometime after Tuesday 9 December 2025 you would like to instruct on the removal of the corrugated asbestos sheeting but this will require pulling over the remainder of the building. You may proceed with this but only after you have confirmed in writing to the local planning authority when the collapse took place and it would be useful to receive details of who will be removing the asbestos and where it will be taken. Photos of the asbestos retrieval works would also be helpful for the record.

You may still be advised to submit an application for listed building consent seeking full removal of the building from site but in the meantime, you are advised that if you proceed to completely take down the building to retrieve the roof material then this should be undertaken carefully avoiding where possible unnecessary damage to any original frame members that remain intact. Frame members should then remain on site and protected from the weather pending a further officer inspection.

As you appeared to acknowledge on site, the barn's collapse effectively renders the following permissions void:

- 25/00509/FPH - Renovation and conversion of existing barn into habitable accommodation, to include insertion of windows to front and side elevations, insertion of two rooflights in rear elevation and repair or replace existing cart doors. Installation of mezzanine floor, and erection of single storey glazed extension to link to main dwelling, following part demolition of existing side store.*
- 25/00510/LBC - Renovation and conversion of existing barn into habitable accommodation, to include insertion of windows to front and side elevations, insertion of two rooflights in rear elevation and repair or replace existing cart doors. Installation of mezzanine floor, and erection of single storey glazed extension to link to main dwelling, following part demolition of existing side store.*

I advise that you report this matter to the Health and Safety Executive and Hertfordshire Building Control if you have not done so already and you will see that I have copied in the Council's Ecologist.

5.3.11 The concerns raised by Historic Building & Places (HB&P) and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) together with Historic England's signposting are noted. Of these SPAB's response is the only objection and not being a Statutory Consultee, it is considered that this application can be determined under delegated powers. I respond as follows to matters raised by SPAB:

SPAB - The 2021 structural survey concluded that the barn was structurally sound and capable of conversion without strengthening, yet no evidence has been submitted to show how and why its condition deteriorated so significantly by 2025.

Response: See 5.3.4 above with reference to 'damage', 'distortion', 'severe out of vertical leaning', 'stress' and 'broken purlin and damaged eaves beam'. The 2021 PIR by Benet Consulting Limited does not state that the barn was structurally sound but it is acknowledged that the structural report prepared by Philip Harvey Associates Ltd (Nov 2010) concludes that "The barn structures are considered to be of permanent and substantial construction and would be suitable for conversion to other uses, without the necessity for further strengthening or alteration".

SPAB - There is also no information to demonstrate what action(s) may have been taken to halt deterioration and prevent/avoid collapse.

Response: An Urgent Works Notice was not issued and there is no mitigation on this point. However, Storm Bella and a further event in December 2025 were significant factors and impeded a repair/renovation.

SPAB - Application contains no information confirming whether any steps were taken after the collapse to stabilise what remained and prevent any further losses, e.g. propping, shoring, temporary protection of surviving fabric.

Response: Photo evidence following my site visit clearly shows the building 'on its knees' and it was considered that the building was beyond the point at which a viable stabilisation scheme could be affected. No further steps were taken to prevent further loss.

SPAB - It is also not clear why the complete removal of all historic fabric, including the brick plinth and timber frame has been undertaken. And why a small number of timbers have been retained in storage, no explanation is given for their selection or why other surviving elements were not protected.

Response: On **13 March 2026** I visited site again and inspected the timber frame sections salvaged from the site clearance. It is considered that the condition and amount salvaged material is insufficient to facilitate reconstruction or indeed to use in a possible new build scheme. The condition, number and type of frame sections salvaged is disappointing and does not translate into the whole timber frame with only a dozen or so sections available for inspection. The covering letter simply says, "*any timber lengths which were salvageable were retained and stored on site*". My understanding is that all other material has subsequently been disposed of.

SPAB - The supporting letter states that the urgent demolition was required owing to a health and safety risk arising from asbestos and the fire hazard posed by ivy. However:

- both asbestos and ivy were present for many years without being treated as emergencies.
- no evidence has been submitted demonstrating that they suddenly presented an immediate, unmanageable risk; and
- no specialist advice has been provided indicating that demolition was the only safe response.

Response: The Asbestos Certificate of Identification and Consignment Note at Appendix 3 of the covering letter includes confirmation by Athena Environmental Solutions Ltd that Chrysotile roof sheets were present. According to AI Overview:

"Chrysotile asbestos (white asbestos) is dangerous and a proven human carcinogen. While its curly fibres are often considered less potent than amphibole asbestos, it causes serious diseases, including lung cancer, mesothelioma, and asbestosis. It is safe only if left undisturbed and undamaged in situ.

Why it's Dangerous: Chrysotile is the most common form of asbestos, used in products like roofing, insulation, and car brakes. It becomes dangerous when fibres become airborne through damage, deterioration, or renovation."

The fact that the asbestos was disturbed implies that the risk level had increased to a level that required expedient action.

SPAB - If the ivy was considered a fire or safety hazard, it is unclear why it was allowed to grow unchecked to such an extent. Long standing unmanaged vegetation generally indicates a lack of routine maintenance, and any risk arising from such neglect cannot reasonably be used to justify demolition in accordance with NPPF paragraph 209.

Response: Noted and not contested.

5.4 Alternative scheme

5.4.1 Non applicable.

5.5 Pre-Commencement Conditions

5.5.1 Non applicable.

5.6 Conclusion

5.6.1 Great weight should be given to an asset's conservation (212, NPPF) and matters of this nature are addressed with the seriousness they deserve. Upon reflection and once it became apparent that the 2011 consented was not going to be implemented the building's condition should have been monitored and by the time that further damage was incurred by Storm Bella, the applicant should have been encouraged to fully shore up the building and remove invasive ivy growth. Alternatively, the Local Planning Authority could have considered exercising its powers under Section 54(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to preserve this unoccupied listed building.

5.6.2 Furthermore, it is disappointing that the applicant has not followed precisely the actions stated in my 5 December email including: i) retrieval of roof materials should be undertaken carefully to avoid unnecessary damage to the historic frame; ii) that the remaining structure should be protected, and iii) that a photographic record of the asbestos removal should be produced. Notwithstanding that the applicant has engaged with the LPA and whilst measure could have been put in place to save this building in the last 15 years and before, a combination of financial constraints, Storm Bella, Covid pandemic, more recent accidental collapse together with no Urgent Works Notice intervention by the LPA, has resulted in the loss of this grade II listed building, the framing of which was not in particularly good order over 15 years ago.

5.6.3 The only objection to this application is from SPAB. These include that this retrospective application does not demonstrate compliance with national policy and that the total loss of the barn has not been justified or that the works were necessary as per Section 9 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 in respect of offences and unauthorised work. Furthermore, the proposal does not adhere to Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 or the aims of Section 16 of the NPPF and the aims of Policy HE1 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031. However, I consider that sufficient evidence has been provided to assist with an understanding as to how this point has been reached.

5.6.4 It is acknowledged that the building's loss may have been avoidable and yet withholding the grant of listed building consent would leave this matter unresolved, not allowing closure of what is considered to be an unrecoverable situation. The supporting documentation evidences the barn's history over nearly two decades whilst positive interventions by the owner to save this building would have served to dismiss any claims (which have not been made) of foul play or wilful neglect.

6.0 **Recommendation**

6.1 That Listed Building Consent be **GRANTED**.

Signed  Shaun Greaves Determining Officer	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Date: 27 April 2026	