

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2016

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 29 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/D/16/3154609

Coe Farm, Denton Lane, Casthorpe, Lincolnshire NG32 1DZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr D Donger against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref S16/0762, dated 17 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is an implement shed (to be used for domestic purposes).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a large building with profiled sheet cladding to its walls and roof that would replace a much smaller timber shed. It would be located on a small parcel of land which is separated from the main garden area, associated with the house and its buildings, by the access to Mucklethorn Lodge. This land appears as a separate and relatively isolated plot. The new building would be located close to the adjacent unmade track and public footpath.
 4. Coe Farm originally included a large scale agricultural building but this was removed when the replacement dwelling was accepted. Mucklethorn Lodge resulted from a barn conversion. The character of this range of buildings has therefore fundamentally changed. The houses, the large modern brick outbuildings and the high brick boundary walls to the front of the site give this group of properties a formal and domestic character. This differs significantly from the rural and agricultural characteristics evident in the photographs taken prior to the development of the replacement dwelling.
 5. The proposed building would represent a substantial new structure that would be distinct both physically and in design and appearance terms from the adjacent properties. Although such a structure may be acceptable when considering the provision of an agricultural building in certain circumstances, it would be entirely at odds with the current appearance and character of the
-

adjacent properties. Its exposed position, close to the adjacent track and public footpath, would result in it being an extremely prominent feature.

6. I note the suggestion that the parcel of land is part of the curtilage of the dwelling but even if I accept this to be the case, I find no justification for locating new development in such a prominent position. The design and materials would be entirely at odds with the adjacent buildings and would detract from the character and appearance of these properties and the wider area. It would represent an unacceptable and incongruous addition when experienced from the footpath.
7. Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy 2010 requires that new development is appropriate to the character and significant natural, historic and cultural attributes and features of the landscape and contributes to its conservation, enhancement or restoration. Sections 4 and 5 require that the layout and scale of buildings and the quality and character of the built fabric and their settings be assessed. As the proposal would detract from the character, appearance and setting of the adjacent buildings and the wider landscape, it would be contrary to the policy and it would represent particularly poor design in this context. The *National Planning Policy Framework* is clear that permission should be refused for development of poor design.
8. The Council have referred to Mucklethorn Lodge as an undesignated heritage asset. The significance of the property has not been explained. Given the lack of any details or documentation in this regard, I share the appellant's concerns with regard to the appropriateness of such a reference. However, as I find that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the area, this is not a matter that would lead me towards a different conclusion.
9. Whilst it is suggested that the Council have no objection to a building in this location, I find no justification for allowing a domestic outbuilding of this scale and design so close to the route of the footpath and track. Requiring alternative materials by condition would not overcome my concerns. Overall, although I have had regard to the matters raised by the appellant, I have not found that they outweigh my concerns with regard to the harm that would result to the character and appearance of the area. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR