



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2021

by Diane Cragg Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F2415/D/21/3279739

**Sutton Lodge Farm, The Penfold, Frolesworth Road, Broughton Astley
LE9 6PG**

- 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 M Wagstaff against the decision of Harborough District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00445/FUL, dated 4 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension and replacement of door with patio doors.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension and replacement of door with patio doors at Sutton Lodge Farm, The Penfold, Frolesworth Road, Broughton Astley LE9 6PG in accordance with the terms of the application ref 21/00445/FUL dated 4 March 2021 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 181393-PL01 Rev A, 181393-PL02 Rev A, 181393-PL03 Rev A, 181393-PL04 Rev B, 181393-PL05 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021 and I have had regard to it in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The Penfold is a detached dwelling that comprises part of a former agricultural complex altered and converted into four residential dwellings. The complex has a common architectural theme with the main buildings being of modest height

with a strong linear form and a consistent palette of materials. There are variations in the elevational treatment of each dwelling reflecting the historic openings prior to the conversion of the buildings.

5. The principal elevation of the appeal property faces into a courtyard with the rear elevation facing towards a large rear garden with ancillary garden building overlooking open countryside. The linear form of the dwelling with attractive projecting brick eaves detail is visible from the adjacent access route, footpath, and bridleway on the approach to the site. Despite the location of the outbuilding within the rear garden and the introduction of planting to the site boundaries, the form of the original agricultural building remains apparent.
6. Nevertheless, the proposed extension is designed as a simple lean-to structure with a limited depth and would be constructed in matching materials. The extension would be set down from the eaves line, maintaining the projecting brick eaves detail and roof shape, and would be set in from the side elevations, allowing the depth and form of the original barn structure to be distinguished. The proposed window openings on the south east elevation would not be conspicuous in the wider landscape and despite their size and coherent appearance would not detract from the wider informal arrangement of windows characteristic of the original barn conversion scheme.
7. I appreciate that the diamond pattern of brick work on the main outer wall would be lost, but the property and the brick feature have no specific designation and my attention has not been drawn to the feature having any local significance. In addition, the diamond pattern has limited visibility in its context and its loss would not be detrimental to the former agricultural complex as a whole.
8. The Council considers that the proposed widening of the existing door opening on the east elevation would not materially harm the appearance of the barn and I see no reason to disagree.
9. Consequently, the proposed development would not detract from the character and appearance of the host property or the area and would accord with Policies GD3 and GD8 of the Harborough Local Plan 2011 to 2031 adopted 30 April 2019, where these policies seek to ensure that minor extensions are subordinate in scale and appearance to the existing building and are sympathetic to local vernacular. The development would also accord with the Supplementary Guidance note 8 where it says that extensions should be small, simple and follow the building's traditional form.
10. The Framework seeks to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history and maintain a strong sense of place, and the National Design Guide (Design Guide) promotes well-designed development that responds positively to the features of the site and its surroundings. I am satisfied that the proposal would be consistent with the approach set out in the Framework and the Design Guide.

Other Matters

11. An appeal decision in respect of the garden building at the appeal property has been brought to my attention¹. I agree with the Council that the proposed extension is to be considered against different policies. Therefore, whilst I have

¹ Appeal ref APP/F2415/D/20/3253235

had regard to the comments of the Inspector in terms of the overall appearance of the building group, I have determined the proposed development on its own merits.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, in the interests of clarity, a condition is necessary to ensure that the proposed development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. To achieve a satisfactory appearance, it is necessary to attach a condition to ensure that the materials used match the existing property.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to the evidence before me, I conclude that the proposal would accord with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal is allowed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR