
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 October 2020

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/D/20/3253542

Iron Stone Barn, Rock Road, Washington RH20 3BQ

- 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 Mark Ellis against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/20/0128, dated 17 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is new porch to create entrance and installation of circular window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the site address from the planning application form although I note it is expressed differently on other documents.

Main Issues

3. The main issues raised in respect of this appeal are the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and its effect upon the setting of the adjacent listed building and historic farm complex.

Reasons

4. The existing building was once a barn. Although it has been converted to a dwelling and extended it still retains much of its original barn appearance with the later extensions reflecting the original character of the building. The proposed porch would project beyond the existing form of the building. Given its siting and, in part, pitched roof design, it would appear as a discordant addition of contrasting domestic appearance to that of the barn. The conversion of the barn has resulted in some domestication to the appearance of its former barn structure. However, despite using materials that would match the existing building, the proposed porch would add a domesticating feature that would further detract from the original form and character of the host barn building. Consequently, the proposed porch would be a visually harmful addition despite representing a subservient addition to the barn.
5. The former barn is situated in close proximity to a Grade II listed building and formed part of the historical farmstead of Rock Place Farm. Although both the

barn and the listed building are now within separate curtilages, I observed that it is still possible to see how the separate buildings were functionally related. The former barn is, therefore, an historic agricultural building relating to the farmstead. Its significance is drawn from its historic and architectural value in that the barn formed an integral part of this group of buildings that formed the historical farmstead. It is also therefore an important building within the setting of the listed building.

6. The proposed porch would be sited adjacent to Rock Place Farm and in a position where it would be visible within both the context of the listed building and the historic farmstead. Having found that the porch extension would be a harmful visual extension to the barn, it would also be visually harmful to the setting of a listed building, together with the historic setting of the farmstead. A hedge and fence, in addition to some trees, run along the boundary that denotes the curtilages of Rock Place Farm and Iron Stone Barn. Nonetheless, the porch, along with its roof, would be visible above the hedge and fence therefore the harm would be visible when viewed in the environs of Rock Place Farm.
7. The proposed development would be harmful to the setting of a designated asset. I consider there would be less than substantial harm to this designated heritage asset, and I give this considerable importance and weight.
8. In accordance with paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) I must weigh the harm against the public benefit of the proposal. The development would provide a porch that would improve the living environment and access to the property for the appellant. As this would be a personal benefit the proposal would not make a social contribution that would benefit the public. Given the short-term nature of the development its construction would provide limited economic public benefit. The proposal would not create harm to biodiversity, but this would be a planning requirement that the development would need to satisfy in its own right and, as such, the lack of environmental harm in this respect would not be seen as a benefit of the scheme. The personal and economic benefits are insufficient to outweigh the harm identified. I conclude, therefore, that the proposed development would fail to accord with national policy that requires special regard to be given to the desirability of preserving the setting of a listed building under (Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990).
9. I acknowledge that the new window element is acceptable to the Council. I also note that Washington Parish Council raise no objection to the proposal and that no representations were received in relation to the Council's consultation process, albeit this does not automatically indicate local support for the proposal. Notwithstanding this, there remains the requirement to consider the proposal in terms of the wider public interest.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the setting of the adjacent listed building and historic farm complex. As such, the proposed development would conflict with Policies 28, 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2019 and the provisions of the Framework. These policies and the Framework seek, amongst other matters, extensions to be accommodated appropriately within the curtilage of the existing dwelling and

for development to respect the character of the surrounding area and the historic environment.

11. I have been directed to the Framework's encouragement to optimise the potential of a site to accommodate and sustain development and to promote an effective use of land. Notwithstanding this, the Framework also indicates that in regard to decision-making planning law requires applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material consideration indicate otherwise. I have found that the proposed development does not accord with the development plan and that the other considerations do not justify a departure from it.

Conclusion

12. Having regard to the above the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR