
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2020

by K A Taylor MSC URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D2320/D/20/3255905

Pack Saddle Barn, Wigan Road, Euxton, Chorley, Lancashire PR7 6JZ

- 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 & Mrs T Edge against the decision of Chorley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00301/FULHH, dated 20 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey oak framed orangery extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt. Accordingly, the main issues in this case are:
 - Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019 (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies; and
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

Whether Inappropriate Development

3. The Framework states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 145 of the Framework sets out that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate development, unless it meets one or more of a list of exceptions. This includes that the extension or alteration of a building does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building (paragraph 145 c).
4. Policy HS5 (d) of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026, Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document, 2015 (CLP) sets out the criteria to limit development within the Green Belt. Permission will be granted for the extension of dwellings in the Green Belt provided that the proposed extension should not result in a disproportionate increase in the volume of the original dwelling. Increases of up to 50% (volume) are not

considered disproportionate. This is also supported by guidance in the Council's Supplementary planning documents (SPD)¹.

5. The Framework does not provide a specific definition of what would constitute a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building and, therefore, it is a matter of judgement for the decision maker in the context of any relevant development plan policy or guidance.
6. The Council advise, the proposed extension would result in less than 50% volume of the original dwelling. This is not disputed by the appellant, and as such there is no reason to disagree. I am, therefore satisfied that the proposed extension would be modest and the increase in volume would be below the threshold. As such, it would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building.
7. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposal would not comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It would accord with CLP Policy HS5, guidance within the Council's SPD and the Framework. Given this finding and that openness is not a separate consideration for development that falls within paragraph 145(c) of the Framework, it is not necessary to consider this matter separately.

Character and Appearance

8. The appeal property is a traditionally constructed barn converted to residential use, the character, design and appearance of which is sympathetic to its locality and previous agricultural use. The proposal would have a modern and contemporary design. However, the roof form would not match the dwelling with a hipped design and the addition of a large domed roof lantern would be an alien feature. Overall, due to the size and scale the proposal would appear as a bulky and incongruous addition to the rear elevation and be at odds with the simplistic design of the dwelling.
9. Furthermore, the proposed window details and glazed door areas would also pay little attention to the character of the former agricultural barn and although the proposed materials would seek to reflect the appearance of the former agricultural building, the design would be overly domestic and unsympathetic to the appearance of the host property. Neither would this design or detailing blend into the elevation. It would be harmful to the appearance of the dwelling. As such, I do not consider it has been carefully designed to enhance the visual appearance of the site or respect the character or harmonise with the original dwelling.
10. It is the appellant's case that, by virtue of a previously granted planning permission for an alternative proposed extension², a fallback position exists. I have not seen any substantive evidence that it could not technically comply with building regulations. As such, this represents a valid fallback scheme. The fallback scheme would be located to a similar position as the appeal proposal, although it would be marginally higher due to the ridge height. Overall, the design of the fallback scheme would be acceptable in regard to its scale, size and massing being in keeping with the character of the original building, it would have suitable glazing with a mono-pitch roof and would have a utilitarian appearance.

¹ Central Lancashire Rural Development SPD, 2012 & Chorley Council Householder Design Guidance SPD, 2017

² 19/01018/FULHH Dated 17 February 2020

11. Nonetheless the fallback position is not disputed by the Council and as such on the basis of the evidence before me, I find that there is greater than a theoretical possibility that the development referred to might take place.
12. However, from the plans submitted it appears that the fallback scheme would be less harmful than the appeal scheme and as such does not justify the proposal which, for the reasons detailed previously, would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property. Consequently, the fallback position advanced does not outweigh my findings.
13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property. It would be contrary to Policy HS5(a) of the CLP, which requires extensions to respect the existing house and surrounding buildings in terms of scale, size, design and facing materials, without innovative and original design features being stifled.
14. It would also be at odds with the guidance contained within the Council's Householder Design Guidance SPD, at paragraph 2.18, it advises that it is important that the design complements the original building, the key issues normally being the roof arrangement, massing and detailing.

Other Matters

15. The site is located opposite a Grade II Listed Building, Pack Saddle Farmhouse. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, requires the decision maker, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest.
16. The Council have not concluded that the proposal would cause harm to the nearby listed building. Based on my site visit, which also included a consideration of the separation distances, boundary treatment screening between the appeal site and the listed building. I have no reason to disagree in respect of this matter and the proposal would not result in any harm to the significance of the heritage asset from the proposal as a development within the setting of a Listed Building. However, this does not outweigh the other harm I have found.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K A Taylor

INSPECTOR