



Appeal Decisions

Site visits made on 4 June 2020

by Jonathan Hockley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 June 2020

Appeal A: APP/Y2620/W/19/3242484

Barn 1, Allens Farm, School Road, Neatishead NR12 8BU

- 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 Kevin Banks-Dunnell against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref PF/19/1778, dated 9 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is a side extension to the existing partially converted barn.
-

Appeal B: APP/Y2620/Y/20/3245840

Barn 1, Allens Farm, School Road, Neatishead NR12 8BU

- 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 Kevin Banks-Dunnell against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref LA/19/1779, dated 9 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2019.
 - The works proposed are a side extension to the existing partially converted barn.
-

Appeal C: APP/Y2620/W/19/3242492

Barn 1, Allens Farm, School Road, Neatishead NR12 8BU

- 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 Kevin Banks-Dunnell against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref PF/19/1780, dated 11 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is to extend the partially converted barn to the rear of the Barn, into the field.
-

Appeal D: APP/Y2620/Y/20/3245835

Barn 1, Allens Farm, School Road, Neatishead NR12 8BU

- 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 Kevin Banks-Dunnell against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref LA/19/1781, dated 11 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2019.
 - The works proposed are to extend the partially converted barn to the rear of the Barn, into the field.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.
3. Appeal C is dismissed.
4. Appeal D is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issues

5. The four appeals relate to two separate schemes at the same site, a barn located to the west of Allens Farm House, a Grade II listed building. At the time of my visit the barn was being converted to residential use. The schemes propose either an extension to the barn to the south east, to the side of the barn (appeals A & B) or as an extension to the south west end of the barn (appeals C & D). The Council are of the view that the barn can be considered as a curtilage structure forming part of the setting of the listed building, and I agree with this view due to its physical proximity and functional relationship with Allens Farm House.
6. The main issue for all appeals is whether the proposals would preserve the special architectural and historical interest of the Grade II listed building and its setting.

Reasons

7. Neatishead is a fairly spread out linear settlement; Allens Farm House is located on the west side of School Road, reasonably close to the village church of St Peter's to the south. Allens Farm House is a grade II listed property dating from the early 18th century, constructed in red brick with a red pantile roof. The façade of the property has a pleasing symmetry with three bays and a central panelled door set within brick pilasters. Windows in the property are noticeably modern and the building is fronted with a circular gravelled turning circle/access. The listing also specifically notes an attached brick wall with curved coping bricks which runs from the south-east corner of the building to the road and along the street edge. To the rear, the farmhouse appears to have had a full length extension, altering the former pitched roof to a mansard one, with the extension having a shallower pitch than the original. A large brick outbuilding is located to the south west of the building.
8. To the west of the farmhouse lies the former farmyard which contains various outbuildings and two large barns, both of which were in the process of being converted to residential use at the time of my visit and had been subdivided from the farmhouse and from each other. Barn 1, which is the subject of these appeals, is largely linear and sited in a roughly south west to north east orientation, attached at its northern edge to Barn 2, which is narrower and extends to the road frontage, with a dogleg to the south east to follow School Road. Within the courtyard for Barn 2, accessed from School Road, is a large new pitched roof garage structure which is located between the rear of this barn and the farmhouse.
9. The barns are constructed in red brick with red pantile roofs. Barn 1 has a catslide/mansard roof towards the south east and a noticeable large hip to the

south end of the roofscape. It is clear from the plans I have available to myself that the conversion of the barns will alter the appearance of them fairly significantly; this was particularly noticeable on my visit on the western side of Barn 1 where the extent of rebuilding that had been required was obvious. Plans indicate that a further catslide roof would also be built on the south end of Barn 1, extending from the current distinctive hip to incorporate an old area of previous barn footprint.

10. The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special interest to be given to the desirability of preserving a listed building and any features or architectural interest it possesses. Paragraphs 193-194 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) says when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The Framework also makes it clear that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration of a heritage asset, or by development within its setting.
11. The significance of Allens Farm House, as far as its exterior is concerned, derives essentially from its original architectural detailing and the proportions of its façade and its setting onto School Road. The significance of Barn 1 lies in its interrelationship with the farmhouse and the farmyard and buildings, and the materials and design of the structure in keeping with the local vernacular.
12. Policies EN4 and EN8 of the North Norfolk Local Development Framework Core Strategy, September 2008 (the Core Strategy) together state that extensions should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of listed buildings and their settings through high quality, sensitive design, and that all development will be designed to a high quality, reinforcing local distinctiveness, ensuring that the scale and massing of buildings relates sympathetically to the surrounding area and are suitably designed for the context within which they are set. Policy EN2 of the same Strategy states that development proposals should demonstrate that their locations and design protect, conserve, and where possible, enhance the distinctive settlement characters and special qualities and local distinctiveness of the area.

Appeals A & B – Proposed extension to south east.

13. Appeals A & B would entail extending the form of the barn to the south east to allow for an extended kitchen area. The proposal is designed to appear as a separate outbuilding, albeit one connected visually on the south west elevation and connected via glass on the north east elevation. The extension would have a separate pitched red pantile roof and be clad in weatherboarding with a red brick plinth.
14. While the extension would extend the form of the barn to the south east, the direction and orientation of the proposal would partially mirror the existing south east dogleg of barn 2 to the north and there would be enough differentiation to the existing barn for it to be clear that the extension was not an original building and a modern construction. The extension would not extend into the eastern farmyard as much, or be as close to Allens Farm House as the new garage to the south east of Barn 2 and when viewed from the fields to the south and south east, either from gaps in the hedge on Chapel Road or a field footpath linking this road to the village school would not appear out of place or harmful to the setting of the listed building.

15. The roof of the proposal would mirror the listed building in terms of materials. However, whilst it would be similar in form to the garage structure, the height and scale of the roof would, in my view, juxtapose awkwardly with the barns existing hip and catslide forms. The ridge height, in being at a level higher than the join of the new proposed catslide and hipped roof would clash and override the primacy of the original barn, causing harm to the significance and the architectural and historic interest of the barn. While this effect would not be visible from the road and may be hard to ascertain from public areas to the south, public rights and access can change over time. Such an adverse effect would be contrary to policies EN4 and EN8 of the Core Strategy.

Appeals C & D – Proposed extension to the south west

16. Appeals C & D propose extending the barn to the south west, with the proposal effectively extending the linear form of barn 1. The extension would take the form of a weatherboarded building with brick plinth under a flat roof and large central roof lantern. A glass section would connect the building to the end of the barn.
17. In extending the barn to the south west the proposal would extend the physical form of the barn and the farmyard, which would appear out of place and alter significantly the structure and form of the farmyard and its relationship to the farmhouse. Furthermore, the flat roof design of the extension would be at odds with any other building nearby, drawing attention to this incursion beyond the natural realms of the farmyard, an effect further emphasised by the noticeable roof lantern.
18. When viewed from Chapel Road or the aforementioned footpath the design would be noticeable and would clash with the attractive roofscape of Barn 1 behind, causing harm to the architectural and historic interest of the barn and to the setting of the farmhouse. Such an effect would be contrary to policies EN2, EN4, and EN8 of the Core Strategy.

Conclusions

19. Above I have concluded that Appeals C & D would have an adverse effect on the setting of the listed farmhouse and upon the curtilage listed barns, both in terms of its incursion south of the farmyard and by the design of the proposal. While I am of the view that the location of the proposal for Appeals A & B is acceptable given the natural form of the farmyard and other more recent developments, I consider that the design of the proposal would cause harm to the listed barn.
20. Having regard to the advice in the Government's planning practice guidance I consider that the scheme would not reach the high hurdle of substantial harm (as defined in the Framework) to the significance of the heritage assets. However, though less than substantial, there would, nevertheless, be real and serious harm in both cases which requires clear and convincing justification. In this respect the scheme for Appeals C & D causes a higher level of harm than that for Appeals A & B; nevertheless, harm would still be caused by the latter proposal. Paragraph 196 of the Framework indicates that such harm is to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

21. The conversion of the barn is already underway, and this would realise a viable use for the building; there is no indication that an extension is required to achieve viability in this respect. I do not consider that possible future renewable energy uses would constitute a public benefit to be weighed in the balance for these proposals. I have sympathy for the appellant who is clearly conscientious of the special interest of the buildings and has invested heavily in the reconstruction and conversion of the property. I also note that the proposals would provide more space for the appellant. Nevertheless, public benefits of the schemes are insufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm that the proposals would cause, to which I am required to give great weight.
22. I am referred to other schemes which have been granted permission in the locality. However, each case must be considered on its own merits and none of the cases advanced, based on the information provided, appears to be sufficiently similar in terms of design or roofscape with the schemes set before me to constitute a precedence.
23. The appellant raises concerns over levels of advice and assistance provided by the Council during the progress of the applications. Such matters should initially be taken up through the Council's complaints service. I have dealt with the appeals on their own merits.
24. I therefore conclude that the proposals would not preserve the special architectural and historical interest of the Grade II listed building and its setting. Appeals A & B would be contrary to policies EN4 and EN8 of the Core Strategy, and Appeals C&D would also be contrary to these policies as well as to policy EN2. The proposals would also be contrary to the Framework.
25. Therefore, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

Jon Hockley

INSPECTOR