



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 3 December 2019

by Anne Jordan BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 January 2020

Appeal A

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2810/W/19/3237517

Manor House Farm, Nortoft, Guilsborough, NN6 8QB

- 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 and Mrs J Clissold against the decision of Daventry District Council.
 - The application Ref DA/2019/0475, dated 3 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is conversion of single storey barn to residential, plus single storey extension.
-

Appeal B

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2810/Y/19/3237511

Manor House Farm, Nortoft, Guilsborough, NN6 8QB

- 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 and Mrs J Clissold against the decision of Daventry District Council.
 - The application Ref DA/2019/0476, dated 3 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2019.
 - The works proposed are conversion of single storey barn to residential, plus single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council have drawn my attention to the emerging policies in the Daventry Settlements and Countryside Local Plan (Part 2). The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that the more advanced the stage of preparation of the plan, the greater the weight that can be attributed to it. I am advised that the Plan is at an advanced stage of preparation and therefore attribute moderate weight to the policy.
3. The appellant has referred to the Guilsborough Neighbourhood Plan, which he advises was adopted in January 2019. The Council have not referred to the Plan, and I have not been provided with a copy of the document. However, I note that the Council concur with the appellant that the proposal would meet an identified need in the Plan to provide smaller market homes and that, as such, this is not a matter of dispute between the parties.

Main Issue

4. The main issue for both appeals is the impact of the proposals on the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building known as Manor House Farm.

Reasons

5. S16(2) and S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Policy BN5 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and Policy GN2 of the Saved Daventry District Local Plan (LP) together seek to sustain and enhance the significance of designated heritage assets through the development process. Emerging Policy ENV7 also seeks to sustain and enhance the historic environment, including the setting of heritage assets. These policies reflect the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the requirements of the Act.
6. Manor House Farm is a 17th Century farmhouse which has subsequently been altered. It is primarily constructed in stone and slate with later brick additions. The building is no longer used as part of a farm and some of the outbuildings have been converted to residential use. These vary in size and appearance. Lucas Barn and the Bakehouse are both of similar materials and scale to the main Farmhouse. In contrast the building subject to this appeal is constructed in brick and is lower in height. It comprises a long single storey range with arched openings along the front elevation which are the most striking feature of the structure. This outbuilding is listed by virtue of being attached to the range of listed outbuildings.
7. The significance of the Farmhouse as a heritage asset lies as a surviving example of a building of its type and age, and in the contribution the main dwelling makes to the streetscene and the character of the village. The significance of Lucas Barn and the Bakehouse lies in the contribution they make to the setting of the Farmhouse, and in the evidential link they provide to the former agricultural function of the group. As a later addition the significance of the appeal building lies largely in the contribution it makes to the setting of these assets.
8. The proposal comprises the conversion of the appeal building and the erection of a single storey extension, positioned at an angle to the original structure. The resulting building is proposed for use as an independent residential dwelling. I note that the Council have no objection to the conversion of the outbuilding in principle. The proposal would involve a minimal loss of original fabric to form the side opening, which would not be significant. The works would involve glazing four of the original arched openings on the front façade and the fifth would retain the enclosed opening in situ. Alterations to the structure would be minimal and as a result the proposal would retain the form and appearance of the original structure.
9. The addition seeks to mimic the appearance of the outbuilding, the extension is linked to the original building by a smaller addition which is to be used as a hallway. This would be relatively narrow and lower in height than either the existing outbuilding or the main extension. Nevertheless, the solid form of the link, which would have an overhanging roof, would be prominently visible and

would not effectively separate the new addition from the original building in available views. It would appear contrived, neither reflecting the proportions of the attached agricultural building nor being sufficiently subservient in scale to be divorced from the attached structure. Instead, when viewed alongside the addition it would form part of an awkward and incongruous configuration which would fail to sit comfortably alongside the original structure. I am conscious that the appeal building is itself different in appearance to the other listed assets, being a later Victorian addition. Nevertheless, as the extension would harm its appearance, it would both erode the character of the existing listed outbuilding and to a lesser extent would fail to protect the setting of the other heritage assets within the group.

10. The harm identified would amount to “less than substantial harm” which the Framework advises must be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme. The proposal would not represent enabling development, as I have no convincing evidence that the asset is in need of repair, or that it would fall into disrepair or disuse if the appeal were not allowed, and so this matter carries no weight. The proposal would provide an additional dwelling, which would be in a relatively sustainable location, and which would add to housing supply. The Framework seeks to increase the supply of housing. I am also advised that there is a need for smaller dwellings in the area, and note that the proposal would serve this need. I therefore attribute some moderate weight to the provision of housing as a public benefit. The additional household would also help to sustain local services and I attribute this some limited weight, commensurate with the scale of development.
11. The appellant has referred to other developments involving listed buildings at Lucas Barn and Home Farm. Whatever the circumstances of either scheme these developments would not lessen the harm identified in this case.
12. However, the Framework is clear that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and that in considering the impact of development on the significance of heritage assets great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. Taking into account the extent to which the proposal would harm the appearance of the existing curtilage listed outbuilding, and consequently erode the setting of the other heritage assets on site, I attribute greater weight to the harm which would arise to the significance of the asset as a result of this proposal. It follows that the benefits identified would be insufficient to outweigh this harm and that the proposal would fail to comply with national policy outlined in the Framework and with local policy outlined above.

Conclusion

13. The harm to heritage assets would not be outweighed by the other identified benefits of the scheme. Whilst I note the concerns of adjoining occupiers in relation to the potential effects of the proposal on living conditions, as the identified harm to heritage assets is determinative in this case, this matter does not alter my findings above.
14. Accordingly, for the reasons outlined above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR