



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 June 2021

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/W/21/3267173

Lodge Farm, Burton, Lincoln LN1 2RD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Richard Needham against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref 141392, dated 21 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2020.
 - The application sought planning permission for conversion of existing barn to a dwelling without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref 137884, dated 16 November 2018.
 - The condition in dispute is No 10 which states that:
"With the exception of the detailed matters referred to by the conditions of this consent, the development hereby approved must be carried out in accordance with the following drawings:
 - LF-01 received 17th October 2018 – Location Plan
 - LF-02 received 17th October 2018 – Proposed Site Plan
 - LF-04 received 17th October 2018 – Proposed Elevation and Floor PlansThe works must be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the approved plans and in any other approved documents forming part of the application".
 - The reason given for the condition is:
"To ensure the development proceeds in accordance with the approved plans and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and local policy LP17, LP26 and LP55 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. The appeal site is part of Lodge Farm, a smallholding set within open countryside a short distance west of the small village of Burton. In 2018 planning permission was granted for the conversion of an existing building on the site to a dwelling ("the original permission"), and Condition 10 attached to that permission set out the approved plans. The appellant now wishes to use different wall and roof features to those originally permitted, and therefore seeks to vary Condition 10 so that it refers to revised approved drawings.
3. I therefore consider that the main issue is the effect varying the approved drawings would have on the character and appearance of the host building.

Reasons

4. The building to be converted to a dwelling has at its heart a stone-built stable dating from the late 18th century, with pantile roof and red brick tumbling to the gables. There are more recent additions on the eastern and northern elevations, both simple lean-to structures with sheeting roofs at a very shallow pitch. Another large barn-type building with simple corrugated sheet cladding adjoins the western elevation although this and the other buildings on Lodge Farm falls outside the scope of the proposal.
5. While the northern extension in particular is a modern and relatively crude addition, the Council is of the view that the original stable part of the building has substantial architectural and historic significance, and is almost of listable quality. It may be that the appellant has misinterpreted the Council's comments in this regard, as it is not suggested that the appeal building carries the same heritage value as Lincoln Cathedral. Nonetheless, the age and architectural integrity of the core stable building make it a non-designated heritage asset, and while the whole building is currently in a somewhat dilapidated state, from what I saw on my site visit it is undoubtedly capable of being adapted in a way which would retain and respect its historic status.
6. The proposed residential conversion would retain and renovate the existing eastern and northern additions, as they provide a considerable portion of the living space on the ground floor. Under the original permission, the scale and form of the two additions would also be retained, and as a consequence of their limited height and pitched roofs they would therefore be functionally and visually subordinate to the historic stable at the core of the buildings.
7. The revised proposals would introduce parapet walls to the edge of both existing additions, with two glazed lanterns on each roof. The submitted drawings suggest that the parapets would be considerably higher than the eaves height originally proposed. This would add significant bulk to both additions, and in my view the heavier appearance would lead to the additions detracting from and dominating the relatively modest original stable, diminishing its relative significance. The flat roofs and high parapets would give both additions the appearance of modern domestic extensions, which would incongruous alongside the simple agricultural character of the original building. Although they would not be widely visible because of the surrounding topography and planting, the proposed modern lanterns would also be at odds with the historic character of the core stable building.
8. The appellant has referred to other buildings nearby, old and modern, where modern features and materials have been allowed. However, I do not know the precise details of these, the circumstances in which they came into being, or the extent to which they are comparable with this proposal, and they do not add weight in support of the appellant's case in this appeal.
9. I note also both the appellant's desire to create a simple and more liveable building, and the Council's stated support for a sympathetic conversion. However, for the reasons set out above I am of the view that the amendments which the appellant now seeks would not be sympathetic to the original building.
10. Varying the approved drawings as the appellant wishes would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building, and I conclude that proposed

development would conflict with Policies LP26 and LP55 of the 2017 Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. Together these seek to ensure that developments reflect or improve on the character and appearance of their surroundings, and that residential conversions in the countryside are carried out with minimal alteration to existing buildings. It would also conflict with the requirements of Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which aim to achieve well-designed places.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector