
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2017

by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/D/16/3160291

48 Walnut Barn, Church Lane, Hutton BS24 9SN

- 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 Mark Orchard against the decision of North Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 16/P/1219/F, dated 10 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to the rear of the dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension to the rear of the dwelling at 48 Walnut Barn, Church Lane, Hutton BS24 9SN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/P/1219/F, dated 10 May 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: '2367/P/02'.
 - 3) The roof covering of the development hereby permitted shall match that used on the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council has confirmed that soon after it made the decision, the Development Management Policies Plan Part 1¹ (DMPP) was adopted. The policies from the 2007 North Somerset Replacement Local Plan have therefore been superseded.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Hutton Conservation Area (CA). The site is on the edge of the CA and the proposed extension would at least partly go outside of that designated heritage asset. As a part of the main issue, I will also consider the effect of the proposed development on the setting CA and nearby Listed Buildings.

Reasons

4. The appeal site includes a simple 2 storey detached building which was

¹ North Somerset Council, Development Management Policies, Sites and Policies Plan Part 1, adopted July 2016

originally a barn, now a dwelling, within the grounds of a farm close to the settlement of Hutton. The building is positioned along a narrow driveway, set back from the Church Lane although there are other residential buildings nearby some of which were also previously part of the farm complex. The building has a longitudinal emphasise with a pitched roof and forms one side of a courtyard garden. The Cider Barn which runs parallel with the existing building at a higher level to the south, forms the other side of the courtyard.

5. The CA covers an extensive area around the centre of the village and extends down to include Hutton Court to the south-west of the site. The CA includes buildings and spaces of varied character and also varied age. The barn on the appeal site is within the CA but the boundary runs close to the southern side wall and along the driveway that leads towards Hutton Court. Much of the courtyard garden and the Cider Barn are outside of the CA.
6. Hutton Court as well as the gates, piers, flanking walls and railings along the front of the property are Listed Buildings. The barn at the site is part of a complex of traditional former farm buildings that were once connected to the use of Hutton Court and the farm that was connected to it. However, the building is visually distinctly separate from Hutton Court being at a much lower level and a substantial distance away. There are also other buildings in between the appeal site and Hutton Court. The building and the site are not visually significant to the setting of Hutton Court or the other listed buildings around its front boundary. Walnut Barn and the other buildings within the complex of former farm buildings retain some of their utilitarian appearance although have become clearly domesticated.
7. Walnut Barn currently has its garden within the courtyard which is enclosed at the front by a stone wall with landscaping and a timber section of fence above the wall. A gable end of the building faces onto the driveway leading to the site and can be seen from Church Lane. The northern side wall of the barn at the appeal site provides a hard edge at that point in the CA. The building as well as the robust boundary treatment limits views from the CA into the courtyard and southern side of the barn.
8. The proposal would involve an extension with a pitched roof that would be constructed at a right angle towards the rear of the building and would extend out across part of the courtyard towards the Cider Barn. It would be mostly outside of the CA. The ridge of the roof of the extension would be higher than the existing canopy over the entrance at first floor level of the barn but would be set well down below the existing ridge. The extension would be substantially smaller than the original barn and visually subservient to it. The original simple character of the barn would remain predominant and the extension would not be a disproportionate addition in my view. The Cider Barn includes a smaller perpendicular element and the proposal would reflect that part of the existing character of the existing surrounding buildings.
9. The proposed extension would respect the massing, scale and character of the original building and would be sensitive to the wider character of the area. The extension would have a very minor, harmless impact upon the street scene of Church Lane and the driveway that leads to other properties. In relation to the main issue, proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. The setting of the CA and the Listed Buildings would also be preserved. This would comply with DMPP Policies DM32, DM38 and

DM45. The proposal would conserve the significance of the designated heritage assets and would constitute a good design as required by the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

10. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty that the development will be implemented as proposed. The red cedar cladding which is clearly shown on the drawings, is not used on the existing building and so I have amended the standard condition requiring the roof covering matches that on the existing building.

Conclusion

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

Andy Harwood

INSPECTOR