
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2019 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/D/19/3237613

Barn B, Common Farm, Barton Road, Carlton, Market Bosworth, Nuneaton, Warwicks CV13 0RL

- 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 Paul Wragg against the decision of Hinkley and Bosworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/00704/HOU, dated 1 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is for an extension to existing barn conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. I have used the description of the development from the Council's decision notice as this contains a more succinct description of the development than that on the application form.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider courtyard development.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The single storey barn is part of a larger farm complex that appears to have been converted into two separate narrow dwellings that are both L shaped and mirror each other. The southern projections of the dwellings form a traditional courtyard, which together with the simple appearance of the buildings gives a rural character to the buildings.
6. The proposed extension would infill a large portion of the courtyard between the two barns and would extend the full width of the courtyard. Based on the Council's figures, which have not been disputed, the proposal would extend the footprint of the property by around 37%. This would not follow the traditional linear pattern of development set by the two existing barn conversions.

Furthermore, the extension would be constructed from Carlton stone, Yorkshire boarding and corrugated sheeting which would not match the materials used in the construction of the host dwelling.

7. It is noted that a barn was located where the extension is proposed. The extension has been designed to replicate that barn. Nevertheless, this barn was likely used for agricultural purposes and as such was designed to be functional and has since been demolished. It therefore no longer forms part of the character and appearance of the existing residential buildings.
8. Replicating this functional building would harm the traditional linear character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider courtyard development. There is architectural merit in the visual coherence of the two barn conversions and the proposed development would result in the loss of this shared appearance.
9. The appellant notes that they do not consider that the Council has sufficiently justified the use of Policy DM4 of the LP when determining the application within their officer's report. The policy permits extensions to existing buildings in the open countryside where they would lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting. Consequently, the policy is relevant to the proposal before me. I have concluded that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and as such would not lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting of the wider courtyard development.
10. Therefore, the proposed development would add an incongruous feature that would not correlate with the traditional linear appearance of the host dwelling or the wider farmstead. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would not lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting and would therefore be contrary to policy DM4, which sets out what development in the countryside would be considered sustainable, and DM10, which has a selection of criteria that development should achieve including issues regarding design of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Document DPD Local Plan 2006 – 2026 (LP) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

11. I note that there have been no objections to the proposal from interested parties, and the Parish Council supports the extension. However, this is not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have found to the character and appearance.
12. I have some sympathy for the appellant regarding alleged pre-application advice provided by the Conservation Officer in respect of the extension. However, I have no reason to suggest the advice was anything other than informal in nature that would not, in any case, have prejudiced the Council's decision on a subsequent planning application. In any event, it falls to me to assess the merits of the proposed dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR