
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P4415/D/17/3173702

The Old Brick Barn, Upper Whiston Close, Whiston, Rotherham S60 4NS

- 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 Matthew Twigg against the decision of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RB2016/1652, dated 6 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension- Green Belt- Proposals not exceeding 33.3% of original property area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. There is an inconsistency between the name of the host property as indicated on the application form and as shown on the plans. In the interests of clarity I have used the name of the barn as set out on the application form.

Background and Main Issues

3. The Old Brick Barn lies within the Green Belt. The Council considers that the proposed development would not be inappropriate development within the Green Belt. There is no reason for me to disagree with this conclusion. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider courtyard setting.

Reasons

4. The front of the converted barn faces onto a modern development. However, the rear elevation of the property, together with Guthwaite House forms part of a courtyard of attractive, converted historic farm buildings. The former agricultural buildings have been converted to be consistent with the objectives of Saved Policy ENV3.5 of the Rotherham Unitary Development Plan 1999 (UDP) which requires that both the historic nature, and the character of the buildings be unaffected.
5. Whilst the buildings now serve a residential purpose and have been converted to provide separate self-contained units there is still a visual coherence to the group reflecting its historic and former agrarian use. Consequently, any

- adverse impact on the host property would affect the character and appearance of the courtyard as a whole.
6. At my site visit it was clear to me that care had been taken to retain, as much as possible, the simple unadorned, utilitarian nature of the former farm buildings. This included the restricted number, and small nature of the windows and the uninterrupted plane of the rear elevations, and the retention of original features.
 7. The proposed extension would project to the rear of the property and would substantially adversely impact on the character of the former barn by introducing a suburban form. This is because the extension would fundamentally alter the simple form of the converted barn by altering the plane of the rear elevation. Moreover, a substantial element of the original simple rear elevation would be masked by the proposed extension and the large windows and the double doors would not reflect the character or appearance of the host property or the elevations of the other buildings that form the courtyard. In addition, the proposed flue to serve the wood burning stove would appear highly visible as it would breach the line of the eaves of the converted barn.
 8. I am aware that there have been some alterations to neighbouring properties. However, I must consider the proposed appeal on its own merits. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, notwithstanding that I could strictly control the materials to be used in the proposed extension, and could, should I be minded, issue a split decision excluding the flue from the permission, I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to Saved Policy ENV3.5 of the UDP and Policy CS28 of Core Strategy, adopted 2014. Both policies are consistent with the Paragraphs 56 and 64 of the Framework to require good design, and require developments ensure that the existing historic character and appearance of a development and its setting is not adversely affected.
 9. In coming to this conclusion, I note that the appellant is unhappy at the way in which the Council handled the application. However, this matter is not before me. Therefore, on the basis of its adverse impact on both the character and appearance of the host property and its wider courtyard setting, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L. Nurser

INSPECTOR