
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/L1765/D/17/3173581

The Barn, Harmsworth Farm, Botley Road, Curbridge SO30 2HB

- 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 A Brown against the decision of Winchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/03301/HOU, dated 1 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two storey extension at The Barn, Harmsworth Farm, Botley Road, Curbridge SO30 2HB, in accordance of the terms of the application Ref. 16/03301/HOU, dated 1 December 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1055/100 Revision B, 1055/101 Revision B, 1055/103 Revision A, 1055/107 Revision A, 1055/108/ Revision A, 1055/109 Revision A, 1055/111/ Revision A and 1055/112 Revision A, in addition to the Pre-construction Environmental Management Plan (Rev. A)

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the non-designated Heritage Asset and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The proposal relates to a substantial former agricultural barn which has been converted into a dwelling and has been altered and extended in a number of ways since inception. It has irregular fenestration, although openings are numerous and the windows and doors are largely of brown uPVC construction.
4. I note that the subject building is of traditional timber frame construction, and has been identified as a non-designated Heritage Asset by the Council, I have been given no substantive reason to come to a different conclusion on this

designation, however by virtue of the alterations, much of the building's original character as a barn has been eroded over time. Notwithstanding this, the building enjoys a wide range of articulation and sits within a substantial plot which forms part of a group of buildings within the wider complex of Harmsworth Farm. It is accessed via a private drive and public views of it are limited.

5. The extensions proposed would be of quite a scale in themselves, nevertheless in totality, bearing in mind their position on what amounts to be a large building, with articulated and varied roof forms/heights, including flat roof elements, I consider that the extensions would appear subordinate in form. Further, the proposal must also be assessed against its built context, with other buildings within the locality also being of a substantial size and therefore I find that the proposal would not be out of character with its surroundings.
6. I also find that the form/detailing of the proposed extensions are generally sympathetic to the character of the building and therefore no direct conflict would occur either to the Framework or the Historic England Guidance referred to within the Council's submissions. With regard to openings, the guidance tends to deal with openings within original and historic fabric, but does identify a wide range of solutions to installing fenestration within traditional farm buildings. I acknowledge that the guidance highlights that standard 'domestic style' windows can have an adverse impact on the majority of farm buildings, nonetheless, such windows have already been installed and I find that the proposal before me would be in keeping with the character of the barn as it stands today.
7. Consequently, the proposal would not give rise to demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the barn or the surrounding area. I find no material conflict with the Development Plan and the proposal specifically complies with Policies DP.3 and CE.23 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review 2006 and Policy CP20 of the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 2013 which comprise general design criteria. Where concerning the extension to dwellings, the policies permit such proposals, providing that they do not significantly change the character of the existing dwelling, or result in increased visual intrusion by increased size and/or unsympathetic design, whilst seeking to protect and enhance the District's distinctive landscape and heritage assets and their settings.
8. I have had regard to the Policies DM16, DM23, DM29 and DM31 of the emerging Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 which are concerned with site design criteria, rural character, heritage assets and locally listed heritage assets respectively. Whilst I consider that Policy DM29 is not relevant, as it relates to designated heritage assets, nonetheless, the other three policies require development to respond positively to the character, appearance and variety of the local environment, within and surrounding the site, in terms of design, scale and layout; seek to prevent unacceptable effects on rural character and require the heritage significance of locally listed heritage assets to be a material consideration when determining the application.
9. In addition, I have had regard to the guidelines as set out with Part 8 of the Council's High Quality Spaces Supplementary Planning Document which requires extensions to be sensitively related to the existing building, and the character of

the area, to convey the incremental transition of the building, by allowing the character of the original structure to still be clearly discernible and to generally be subservient to the host dwelling, which I consider to be the case here.

10. Consequently and pursuant to paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the "Framework") I have taken into account the effect of the proposal on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset. Nonetheless, I consider that the proposal would still allow the barn to be read as a traditional rural building albeit one that has been significantly altered since its original conversion.

Conclusion and Conditions

11. Therefore, for the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, the Council has suggested a condition requiring external materials to be used in the construction of the extensions to match those of the existing building. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, this is an appropriate condition. In addition, for the avoidance of doubt, a condition requiring that the development is carried out with the approved plans is also imposed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR