



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2017

by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/D/17/3173079

The Granary, Bleak Farm, Grantham Road, Hough on the Hill NG32 2BJ

- 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 S Lord against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref S16/2628, dated 25 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as extension and alterations to existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development set out in the header above is taken from the application form. However, the plans submitted also show the proposed conversion of the adjoining barn and associated subdivision of the courtyard area. Notwithstanding the reference in the description of development to other works to the appeal property (which are shown on the plans) or the formation of an additional dwelling, the parties have confirmed that the application, and this the appeal, relates only to the proposed extension. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

Reasons

4. The dwelling the subject of this appeal was created through the conversion of part of a larger U-shaped group of largely intact traditional agricultural buildings¹. The main features of the existing structures are the stone walls with dressed stone arched lintels, stone quoins, stone eaves detailing, pitched roofs and an architectural rhythm created in places by cast iron columns that support lower ranges within the complex. On the north elevation, the four cast iron columns along the front of the lower range linking two taller elements have been retained, with infill brickwork set behind the columns enclosing the

¹ SK.92/0374 – Alterations to farmhouse and conversion of barns to two dwellings – Approved 24 August 1992

internal space. Notwithstanding that infill brickwork, and the use of relatively domestic fenestration and doors, I consider, contrary to the views of the appellant, that the building still retains much of its original robust vernacular character and appearance.

5. In a case such as this, where the purpose of the original planning permission for conversion was evidently to put this historic complex to a new use, thereby maintaining it in the landscape, it is appropriate to have the origins of the building, as well as its current domestic use in mind when considering proposals to extend it. To that end, in granting permission, permitted development rights were removed in the interests of ensuring that the quality of the original scheme was not diminished or eroded by insensitive works in the future.
6. The extension proposed would be located centrally on the front elevation and would comprise of a modern extension with flat roof and large amounts of glazing, set within a thin structural frame. It would be linked to the main dwelling by a subservient glazed link.
7. Whilst traditional buildings can often be extended by the use of contrasting and modern elements, in this instance the combination of the box-like design, the materials and glazing and the overall projection of the extension would be harmful to the historic character of the existing dwelling. Although the central element has the more domestic character of the overall conversion, it has still been carried out sensitively and in materials which reflect the character of the buildings as a whole. The retention of the cast iron pillars along the front elevation further preserve the traditional nature of the existing building. The contrasting materials and design of the proposed extension would serve to introduce a dominant and incongruous feature to the range of traditional buildings and the obscuring of two of the cast iron pillars would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling through the loss of the traditional appearance that the original conversion sought to retain.
8. Furthermore, whilst I acknowledge that the current views across the landscape are somewhat constrained and the development would allow wider views, this would be a personal benefit to the occupants which would not outweigh the harm to the traditional character of the existing building. I note also that the appellant considers that the extension would create a focal point and allow the occupants to fully appreciate the modifications that have taken place over the years. However, there has been no justification put forward to support why this would be required and as such these considerations do not outweigh the concerns identified above.
9. The site is set back along a lengthy access driveway and is screened from view from the public realm by hedging within the site and along the site frontage. As such, the proposed extension would not be visible outside of the site and there would be no harm caused to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Nevertheless, this does not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
10. The status of the existing building as a non-designated heritage asset has not been reasonably justified in any of the evidence provided to me. I also note that there are no local lists identifying non-designated heritage assets. Nevertheless, the overall conversion of the agricultural barns has historic and architectural merit and as such, regardless of any formal or informal

designation, the extension would result in a significant level of harm to the traditional character of the building.

11. I note the example of contrasting design identified in the English Heritage guide however I am not aware of the specific circumstances behind this development and can therefore give this limited weight in my considerations. Furthermore, it would appear to be on the rear of a building whereas the proposed development would be located on the front elevation in this instance.
12. As such the proposal fails to comply with Policy EN1 of the South Kesteven Adopted Core Strategy which seeks to ensure that development is appropriate in terms of historic character and layout and scale.

Conclusions

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

R Norman

INSPECTOR