
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/19/3237499

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/2018/1051, dated 22 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is conversion of barn to residential, plus one and a half storey extension.
-

Appeal B

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2810/Y/19/3237490

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/2018/1052, dated 22 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2019.
 - The works proposed are conversion of barn to residential, plus one and a half storey extension.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of single storey barn to residential, plus one and a half storey extension at Manor House Farm, Nortoft, Guilsborough in accordance with application ref DA/2018/1051 and the plans submitted with it, and subject to the conditions attached to this decision.
2. Appeal B is allowed and listed building consent is granted for conversion of single storey barn to residential, plus one and a half storey extension at Manor House Farm, Nortoft, Guilsborough in accordance with application ref DA/2019/1052 and the plans submitted with it, and subject to the conditions attached to this decision.

Procedural Matters

3. The scheme was revised during the course of the application and was determined on the basis of revised plans ref P3L and P4C. I have therefore also determined the appeal on this basis.

4. 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.
5. 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 comply with an identified need in the Plan to provide smaller market homes and that this is not a matter of dispute between the parties.

Main Issue

6. Accordingly, the main issue for the 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

7. 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. and this reflects the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the requirements of the Act.
8. Manor Farm House 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. The outbuilding is listed by virtue of being attached to the range of listed outbuildings.
9. 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 in the contribution it makes to the setting of these assets.
10. The proposal comprises the conversion of the appeal building including the erection of a one and half storey extension, which together would form a

separate residential dwelling. A single storey glazed link is proposed which would link the range to the newly constructed one and a half storey addition, positioned at right angles to the range.

11. The proposal would retain the form and appearance of the original structure by glazing four of the original arched openings on the front façade, with the fifth retaining the existing doorway. The proposed addition would be separated from the original building by a glazed link which would separate the older building from the new addition and effectively preserve the original form of the range. These alterations would be sympathetic to the character of the building and would largely preserve its appearance.
12. The new addition would be higher than the existing outbuilding and its position, at right angles to the range, would broadly echo that of the Bakehouse. Nonetheless, it would be relatively modest in scale and would not compete with either the Bakehouse or Lucas Barn. It would have a contemporary appearance due to the high proportion of glazing in the south facing elevation. However, due to its sympathetic proportions, and the extent to which its position respects the existing structures on site, the new addition would not appear obtrusive within the mixed palette of outbuildings that sit on the site. In this regard, although the addition would provide a degree of contrast with the traditional appearance of the brick outbuilding, and with the Bakehouse and Lucas Barn, provided the materials for construction of the addition were sympathetic, the building could be comfortably assimilated into the group.
13. The Council have no objection to the conversion of the outbuilding in principle and the proposal would lead to a minimal loss of original fabric to form the side opening, which would not be significant. The main impact of the proposal would be in relation to the effect of the development on the setting of the other assets in the group. The building would be visible in shared views of Lucas Barn and the Bakehouse, and to a much lesser extent the Farmhouse due to its distance from the Farmhouse, and the position of intervening structures. In these views the new structure would be an obviously recent addition to the historic group. Nevertheless, the appeal building itself is not contemporaneous with the Farmhouse, or the other outbuildings, and is distinct in character. As a result, further variation would give rise to only a moderate erosion of one aspect of the existing setting.
14. The harm identified would amount to “less than substantial harm” which the Framework advises must be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme. I have no evidence that the proposal would represent enabling development, as the asset is not in need of immediate repair and I have no evidence that it would fall into disrepair or disuse if the appeal were not allowed. Accordingly, this matter carries no weight.
15. The proposal would provide an additional dwelling, in a relatively sustainable location, which would add to housing supply. The Framework seeks to increase the supply of housing, and this is a benefit to which I attribute some moderate weight. Having regard to the extent of less than substantial harm identified, I am satisfied that it would be outweighed by the benefits of the scheme and that the proposal would therefore comply with the Framework. As the harm identified to heritage assets is justified in this case, the proposal would also not conflict with local policy in relation to heritage assets.

Other Matters

16. Although not a reason for refusal, the residents of Lucas Barn have expressed concerns in relation to the effect of the proposal on their living conditions. I noted on site that the garden was enclosed to the side by a high stone wall, and that as a result the ground floor window on the rear elevation of the proposed addition, and the glazed link would be partly screened. As the link would not be a usable space I do not consider that it would lead to a significant level of overlooking to the garden or the dwelling. Furthermore, as the rear window would serve a utility room, it would be possible to use obscured glazing on the room. The proposed rooflights would be positioned at a high level and unlikely to give rise to overlooking. Therefore, notwithstanding the proximity of the new structure, subject to an appropriate condition requiring obscured glazing on the rear window, it would not give rise to significant harm to the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. Furthermore, whilst I note concerns regarding noise arising from construction, I am satisfied that an appropriate condition, limiting hours of construction, would ameliorate any unacceptable impacts in this regard.

Conclusion and Conditions

17. Accordingly, for the reasons outlined above, the appeal is allowed. In addition to the suggested conditions relating to the duration of the approvals, and the approved plans a condition requiring that samples of the external materials are approved by the Council is necessary to ensure an appropriate external appearance for the development. Furthermore, taking into account the potential for further alterations to impact upon the setting of the nearby listed structures, conditions removing permitted development rights which would allow the extension or alteration of the proposed dwelling are also reasonable and necessary to ensure the effect of future development on heritage assets is taken into account.
18. In order to ensure that the living conditions of adjoining occupiers are, as far as possible, protected during construction, a condition restricting the hours of construction is reasonable and necessary. A further condition, requiring that the rear window serving the utility room is obscure glazed, is also necessary to protect the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. Lastly, the Council have also suggested a condition relating to potential contamination on site. In order to ensure the safe development of the site, this condition is also reasonable and necessary.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR

Conditions

Appeal A

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the location plan and amended drawings Clissold/P3L and Clissold/P4C deposited with the Local Planning Authority on 6 August 2018.
3. Prior to construction works above slab level samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwelling hereby permitted shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development shall be carried out which falls within Classes A, B, C, E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the Order without the prior express consent of the Local Planning Authority.
5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended) (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows, other than those expressly authorised by this permission, shall be constructed.
6. In the event that unexpected contamination is found at any time when carrying out the development hereby approved, it must be reported immediately to the Local Planning authority and development works on the site shall cease and an investigation and risk assessment undertaken to assess the nature and extent of the unexpected contamination.
A written report of the findings shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, together with a scheme to remediate, if required, prior to further development taking place on the site.
7. Demolition or construction works shall take place only between 8am and 6pm on Monday to Saturday and shall not take place at any time on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.
8. The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the window at rear serving the utility room has been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the window is installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

Appeal B

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the location plan and the amended drawings Clissold/P3L and Clissold/P4C deposited with the Local Planning Authority on 6 August 2018.
3. Prior to construction works above slab level samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwelling hereby permitted shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.