
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2016

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/D/16/3155704

Brickyard Barn, Mallory Road, Bishops Tachbrook, Warwickshire CV33 9QD

- 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 Peter Leopold against the decision of Warwick District Council.
 - The application Ref W/16/0717, dated 16 August 2015, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension and detached car port.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the Council's description of the development in reaching my decision as it more fully describes the details of the development than that given on the original planning application form. The appellant's appeal form also makes reference to the updated description. I shall determine the appeal on this basis accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the converted barn and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey timber framed converted residential barn with a single storey front and side extension. The property is located in an isolated rural location and accessed via a long track from Mallory Road. An agricultural building is located immediately to the east of the site. The appeal site is set in attractive countryside, defined by gently undulating fields punctuated by hedgerows and tree boundaries.
 5. Policies DP1 and RAP2 of the Warwick District Local Plan 2007 (LP) seek to ensure that development positively contribute to the character and quality of its environment. Policy RAP7 of the LP requires all proposals to convert rural buildings to be undertaken without extensive alterations to the external appearance of the building and to retain and respect the special qualities of the original building and its rural setting. Paragraph 8.26 of the LP outlines that, in the case of barn conversions, the Council is extremely unlikely to grant approval for any extensions, so as to prevent any disruption to the integrity of the original building. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on
-

Agricultural buildings and Conversions for Barns 2010 (SPG) states that in accordance with the LP policies, the existing design of the original building should be retained and no separate new build garage or other domestic elements should be constructed around the barn in order to protect the setting.

6. The proposal would entail the construction of a single storey pitched roof extension that would project out by approximately 3.3m from the side elevation of the property. The extension would adjoin and mirror the dwelling's existing single storey front extension. The detached car port/garage structure would be located to the south east of the barn conversion.
7. The proposed extension, by virtue of its siting and design, would impact on the original character and appearance of the building by further obscuring the timber framed structure of the converted barn. The proposed car port would be positioned in a characteristic open gap between the converted barn and the adjacent field and would compromise the sense of space and openness around the building. These shortcomings are exacerbated by the extension and car port's prominent position, which would be visible from the entrance to the site along Mallory Road. As such I consider that the proposed extension and car port would result in incongruous and out-of-keeping additions that would cause unacceptable harm to the integrity of the original building and the character and appearance of the converted barn and its rural setting.
8. The appellant states that the proposed extension and car port would be in keeping with the established residential use of the site and the design of the building. The appellant argues that the proposal would be a sustainable form of development that would be consistent with the advice in paragraph 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in that good design is not just about aesthetic considerations but should also address the connection between people and places. However, I consider that these factors would not mitigate the overall harm this scheme would cause to the character and appearance of the building and its setting within the wider countryside nor achieve the standards of design the Framework seeks to promote. It is also not a sustainable form of development for which the Framework makes a presumption in favour.
9. I have noted the development at the existing dwelling at No. 96 Mallory Road drawn to my attention by the appellant. However, the development is not directly comparable to the proposal and has different locational characteristics. I have therefore accorded this limited weight as a precedent in this case.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the development causes harm to the character and appearance of the converted barn and the area. It conflicts with Policy RAP7 of the LP and the Council's SPG. These policies and guidelines, amongst other things, seek to ensure that developments retain and respect the special qualities of the original building and its rural setting.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR