



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2022

**by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 10<sup>TH</sup> February 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W3520/D/21/3283599**

**Green Farm Barn, Badwell Green, Badwell Ash, Bury St. Edmunds IP31 3JG**

- 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 Hinkley against the decision of the Mid Suffolk District Council.
  - The application Ref DC/21/03631 dated 25/06/2021, was refused by notice dated 17/08/2021.
  - The development proposed is Householder Application - Erection of two first floor extensions.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Householder Application - Erection of two first floor extensions at Green Farm Barn, Badwell Green, Badwell Ash, Bury St. Edmunds IP31 3JG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/21/03631 dated 25/06/2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to conditions set out below.
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Floor Plan TL-4446-20-11, Existing and Proposed Elevations TL-4446-20-12, and Site Plans TL-4446-20-13.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property.

### Reasons

3. The site is a detached residential property on a substantial plot within a small group of buildings. There is disagreement as to the status of the property with the Council citing that it is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset due to it being a rural building of traditional appearance and materials.

4. I am mindful that Local Planning Authorities may identify non-designated heritage assets as part of the decision-making process on planning applications<sup>1</sup>.
5. In accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance irrespective of how they are identified, it is important that the decisions to identify them as non-designated heritage assets are based on sound evidence. I have not been provided with substantive evidence to support the designation of the property as a non-designated heritage asset.
6. Nonetheless it would appear from the Council's Officer Report that the significance of the property would be in terms of design and materials in this rural setting.
7. Whilst of traditional rural appearance I note that some elements for instance doors are modern materials. The Council contend that the proposal is out of keeping with the architectural tradition of historic farm buildings in the district, I have not been provided with substantive evidence to demonstrate this or that this is a farm building of historic merit.
8. The proposed extension would add bulk to what is already a large building, I note that the Officer's Report confirms the property has a history of extensions and alterations approved at the site.
9. There are limited views of the existing property from public vantage points given the existing boundary enclosures and landscaping which screen the site to a degree. Therefore, the proposed development whilst adding mass to the building would be relatively inconspicuous in the wider setting.
10. Whilst the existing building is of rural appearance and materials, the proposed first floor additions would be set in from the side elevations retaining part of the single storey pitched roof which would break up the massing of the building.
11. The proposed windows would not be in alignment with the windows on the ground floor, however as this building is a barn conversion one would assume that windows are new additions to the property to facilitate the conversion from a barn. Therefore, the historic merit of these features is questionable, and in terms of design barn conversions are not traditional builds and as such having misaligned windows would not detract from the rural appearance of the building.
12. The proposed development would include traditional materials such as timber boarding which would integrate the additions to the existing property. The proposed development would retain a rural appearance and would not detract from the traditional appearance and materials of the host property.
13. I have taken into account the effect the proposed development would have on the significance of this non-designated heritage asset and find that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property.
14. There is no conflict with Policies CS5 of the Mid Suffolk District, Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008) and Policies HB1 and HB3 of the Mid

---

<sup>1</sup> Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph: 040 Reference ID: 18a-040-20190723

Suffolk Local Plan (1998) (the Local Plan) which seeks to ensure amongst other things that developments are of high-quality design that respects distinctiveness and the built heritage.

15. There is no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which seeks amongst other things that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.
16. The reason for refusal contends there would be conflict with Policy H9 of the Local Plan in terms of respecting local distinctiveness, retain the traditional appearance and character of rural buildings and achieve a high standard of design. However, I disagree Policy H9 relates to the conversion of rural buildings to dwelling subject to criteria listed in the policy. The proposed development is an existing residential dwelling and does not propose conversion of a rural building to a dwelling.

### **Conclusion and Conditions**

17. I have imposed a standard condition relating to the commencement of development. I have included a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. In the interest of safeguarding the character and appearance of the property I have imposed a condition relating to the external materials.
18. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

*C Pipe*

INSPECTOR