
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 30 October 2017

by Nigel Harrison BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 November 2017

Appeal A: Ref: APP/J3720/W/17/3179696

The Coach House, Sambourne Lane, Sambourne, Redditch, B96 6PL

- 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 Luke Egan against the decision of Stratford on Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref: 17/00611/FUL dated 27 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey rear extension.
-

Appeal B: Ref: APP/J3720/Y/17/3179695

The Coach House, Sambourne Lane, Sambourne, Redditch, B96 6PL

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Luke Egan against the decision of Stratford on Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref: 17/00686/LBC dated 27 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2017.
 - The works proposed are erection of a single-storey rear extension and roof light to front elevation.
-

Decisions

1. **Appeal A** is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single-storey rear extension at The Coach House, Sambourne Lane, Sambourne, Redditch, B96 6PL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 17/00611/FUL dated 27 February 2017, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.
2. **Appeal B** is allowed and listed building consent is granted for the erection of a single-storey rear extension and roof light to front elevation at The Coach House, Sambourne Lane, Sambourne, Redditch, B96 6PL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 17/00686/LBCL dated 27 February 2017, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Procedural Matters

3. I have taken the description of the proposed development and works from the Council's decision notices. Although differing from that given on the application forms, it more concisely describes the proposal.

4. The Council has raised no objections to the additional roof light proposed to the front elevation. Based on my own observations I find no reason to disagree.

Main Issues

5. I consider the main issues are: Whether the proposed extension amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and its effect on the openness and character and appearance of the Green Belt (Appeal A); whether the proposed extension would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of this curtilage listed building and the setting of nearby Grade II listed buildings (Appeals A and B).

Reasons

Whether the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt (Appeal A)

6. The appeal site lies within the Green Belt. Paragraph 89 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) says extensions in the Green Belt may not be inappropriate development, provided they do not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. This is reflected in Policy CS.10 of the *Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy 2011-2031* (CS), adopted July 2016.
7. The proposed extension represents approximately a 28% increase in volume compared with the existing building. Although no guidance as to what constitutes 'disproportionate' is given in the policy, the Council is satisfied that the extension would not be disproportionate in Green Belt terms. I find no reason to disagree and conclude on this issue that the proposed extension would not be inappropriate development. As such it complies with CS Policy CS.10 and the Framework. Consequently, the issue of very special circumstances does not arise.
8. Although there would be some impact on the openness and character and appearance of the Green Belt, this would be modest, and in my view not materially harmful.

Whether the proposed extension would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the curtilage listed building and setting of nearby listed buildings (Appeals A and B).

9. Due to its physical proximity and previous functional relationship as part of a working farm I agree with the Council that The Coach House may be considered as a curtilage building forming part of the setting of the nearby Grade II listed buildings. Section 5(2) of the *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990* (the 'Act') states that any structure within the curtilage of a listed building, which although not fixed to the building, forms part of the land and has done so since before 1 July 1948 shall be treated as part of the listed building.
10. The current scheme has been reduced in extent and reconfigured following two previous proposals to extend the property. The single-storey extension now proposed would measure approximately 8.09m x 3.8m in plan and be located to the rear of the property. It would have a pitched roof and would re-use the existing lounge and dining room windows.

11. At the Statutory level, Sections 16 (2) and 66 (1) of the 'Act' require the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
12. CS Policy CS8 seeks to protect the historic environment. It reflects the statutory duty in the Act and national policy the historic environment set out in Section 12 of the Framework. CS Policy CS9 is also relevant as it seeks to achieve high design quality and ensure that development will enhance the sense of place and reflect the character and distinctiveness of the locality.
13. Paragraph 132 of the Framework says when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to its conservation. It notes that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset, or development within its setting.
14. The Coach House stands in an open setting on the edge of open countryside and is part of a historic farm site. It occupies much of the southern side of the former farmyard with the Grade II listed Warren Farmhouse on the west side (now subdivided into two dwellings) and the former stables, barn and cow sheds (also separately listed Grade II) comprising the north and east ranges.
15. A large part of the building's special architectural and historic interest derives from its origins as a modest rural building redolent of the local vernacular style, the use of traditional local materials, and its group setting within the former farmstead. Although I agree that part of the building's significance has been eroded during the conversion process, I still consider its essential qualities have been retained. The conversion to residential use has been effective in preserving the character of this historic farmstead to a large extent, through sympathetic conversion of the buildings themselves and from low-key boundary treatments and landscaping.
16. Much of the significance of the appeal building and neighbouring buildings derives from their relationship to the courtyard (former farmyard) and thus from the more visible front elevations facing that courtyard. However, whilst the rear elevations undoubtedly have significance in terms of the understanding of the heritage assets, they have generally been subject to more intrusive alterations during the conversion process. Rear extensions and a large double garage have also been added in several instances in relatively unobtrusive locations away from the main courtyard. These now contribute to the character and appearance of the group of buildings as a whole.
17. The proposed extension is of modest size, and being located at the rear would barely impinge on views from within the courtyard. Its roofline would be set considerably lower than the existing main two-storey range, and in my view it would be seen as subservient extension that respects the scale, proportions and architectural integrity of the building. The extension would have a plain character and simple form that would complement, and not be at odds with, the simple design and form of the existing building. Although the former rear coach entrance would be concealed by the proposed extension, I do not find this to be particularly harmful *per se*, as the opening has been considerably altered through being infilled with glazing, and has lost much of its significance.

18. Overall I am satisfied that the farmyard character of the group of buildings would be retained, and the position of the proposed extension to the rear would ensure that the visual inter-relationship between the Warren Farmhouse and the ranges of barns and other buildings around the courtyard barns would be maintained. As such, I find that the setting of the nearby listed buildings would be preserved.
19. I therefore conclude on this issue that the proposed extension would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the curtilage listed building (the Coach House) and the setting of nearby Grade II listed buildings, causing no harm to the significance of these heritage assets. As such, I find no conflict with CS Policies CS8 and CS9 or the Framework.
20. I have been referred to two Supplementary Planning Guidance documents: *The Stratford-on-Avon Design Guide* (2001) and the Advice Note '*Extending Your Home*' (2008). The Design Guide is unusually prescriptive in that it says that extensions subsequent to the original conversion are unlikely to be permitted. However, this is an elderly document and although subject to public consultation was not adopted by the Council. I therefore afford it little weight.
21. The Advice Note on the other hand appears to allow extensions to barn conversions provided they fit in with the form of the building, are simple and robust in form, and are relatively small in scale. I am satisfied that the appeal scheme meets these qualifying criteria. This document was adopted by the Council, and although it predates the Framework I afford it moderate weight as a material consideration.

Conditions

22. The Council has not put forward any suggested conditions. However, I have considered whether any conditions need to be imposed in the light of the advice in the Government's *Planning Practice Guidance*.
23. Conditions are needed in both appeals to secure compliance with the submitted plans for the avoidance of doubt, and in the interests of proper planning. Conditions requiring the submission and approval of samples of materials are needed in both appeals to safeguard the special architectural and historic interest of the listed buildings.

Conclusion

24. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the letter of support from the Parish Council, I conclude that these appeals should be allowed.

Nigel Harrison

INSPECTOR

APPEAL A: Ref: APP/J3720/W/17/3179696

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Job No 3101-Drawing No 201; Drawing No 202 Rev A; Drawing No 204 Rev A, and Drawing No.205.
- 3) No development shall commence until details /samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details /samples.

APPEAL B: Ref: APP/J3720/Y/17/3179695

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The works hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Job No 3101-Drawing No 201; Drawing No 202 Rev A; Drawing No 204 Rev A, and Drawing No.205.
- 3) No works shall take place until details/samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.