



---

## Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 1 March 2022

**by A Edgington BSc (Hons) MA CMLI**

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

**Decision date: 8 March 2022**

---

### **Appeal A Ref: APP/J3720/W/21/3282481**

#### **Sandbarn Farm, Snitterfield Road, Hampton Lucy CV35 8AU**

- 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 Leeson against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
  - The application Ref 19/03352/FUL, dated 29 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2021.
  - The development proposed is Single storey side extension, canopy to door at rear, roof overhang to front elevation (Retrospective).
- 

### **Appeal B Ref: APP/J3720/Y/21/3282510**

#### **Sandbarn Farm, Snitterfield Road, Hampton Lucy CV35 8AU**

- The appeal is made under sections 20 and 74 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant conservation area consent.
  - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Leeson against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council. The application Ref 19/03353/LBC, dated 29 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2021.
  - The demolition proposed is Single storey side extension, canopy to door at rear, roof overhang to front elevation (Retrospective).
- 

### **Decision – Appeal A**

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side extension, canopy to door at rear, roof overhang to front elevation at Sandbarn Farm, Snitterfield Road, Hampton Lucy CV35 8AU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/03352/FUL, dated 29 November 2019.

### **Decision – Appeal B**

2. Appeal B is allowed and listed building consent is granted for single storey side extension, canopy to door at rear, roof overhang to front elevation at Sandbarn Farm, Snitterfield Road, Hampton Lucy CV35 8AU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/03353/LBC, dated 29 November 2019.

### **Main Issues – Appeals A and B**

3. The main issues are whether the proposals would preserve the Grade II listed Sandbarn Farm, or any features of special architectural or historic interest.

### **Preliminary Matters**

4. To avoid duplication, I have considered the appeals together where appropriate.

## Reasons

5. Sandbarn Farmhouse (Farmhouse) is a substantial former farmhouse dating from the 17<sup>th</sup> century, with 19<sup>th</sup> century additions to the rear and late 20<sup>th</sup> century restoration. The listing describes a timber framed building with brick infill, built on a brick plinth. The footprint is U-shaped, with a pair of two storey gabled wings with attics separated by a single storey porch dominating the principal elevation. These wings project from a ridgeline which runs parallel to the Farmhouse's flat rear elevation.
6. The principal elevation is characterised by square timber framing with brick infill. This wraps around the corners and extends part way along the flank elevation of each wing. A single storey pitched roof kitchen range is attached to the side of one wing.
7. A comparison of the Farmhouse's front and rear elevations identifies a distinct difference in the geometry of the window and door openings, lintel style and construction, and the condition of the brickwork. Between the timber framing, the brickwork appears very weathered, and there are clearly patches of infill and repair. There is also a pleasing imprecision which gives the principal elevation and the timber framed elements of the flank walls a distinct aged appearance. The projecting porch which separates the two wings on the principal elevation is of 20<sup>th</sup> century origin, but appears to have used reclaimed materials and has been built in a style which complements the principal elevation.
8. The rear elevation appears to be constructed of reclaimed bricks, but the brickwork appears far more consistent in its workmanship. There is rigid geometry in the window arrangement and the windows themselves have arched brick lintels which diverges from the flat lintels of the principal elevation. There is also a degree of ornamentation to be seen in the plat bands between the ground and first floors, and the brick dentils which follow the line of the rear gables.
9. There is very little information before me from the parties with regard to the Farmhouse's heritage significance. On the basis of my observations, I conclude that the older elements of the Farmhouse are to be found on its principal elevation and immediate returns, which confirms the information set out in the listing. The Farmhouse's significance arises from its intact historic fabric, particularly those elements that date from the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and its highly distinctive plan form. There is also significance in its spatial relationship with what appear to be former outbuildings, some of which are now in separate ownership on an adjoining site.

### *Canopy to rear door*

10. An oak framed canopy over a central glazed door on the Farmhouse's rear elevation is larger than given permission in 2018.
11. Insofar as I am able to determine, given the lack of detail in the drawings submitted at appeal, I conclude that the canopy as built is larger than is shown on the elevations. On the 2018 permission the canopy's ridge sits below what appears to be a representation of the platband between the ground and first floors. On the elevation submitted for the appeal the canopy's ridge sits just

above the platband. At my visit I noticed that the ridge sits directly below the first floor window which is three courses above the platband.

12. The canopy has been built with skill and is an attractive feature in its own right. It is perhaps a touch larger than might have been acceptable and I can appreciate the Council's concern in this regard. Nonetheless, on the basis of what is before me I am unable to conclude that it significantly detracts from the appreciation of the Farmhouse and its rear elevation.

#### *Utility room*

13. In 2018 permission was given for an open sided tiled roof gazebo at the end of the single storey kitchen range. The current application sought to create a brick utility room on the same footprint as the gazebo.
14. It is not in dispute that what has been built is larger than the gazebo. However, its ridgeline is below that of the range and it is set back from the range's front and rear elevations. It is seen as an addition to the range, and is visually separated from the Farmhouse's principal elevation by a brick wall. The materials and detailing are sympathetic to the host dwelling, and it has similar styling and typology. On the basis of what is before me I am satisfied that although it is slightly larger than what was approved, the utility room does not detract from the significance of the Farmhouse.

#### *Roof overhang*

15. The front elevation of the kitchen range projects beyond the Farmhouse's principal elevation and its front roof slope has been extended to create a short overhang above a new entrance door. The kitchen overhang blends seamlessly with the kitchen range's roof but projects across the front elevation of the northern wing. This could be seen as a disadvantage as it blurs the boundary between the kitchen range and the adjacent gabled wing. However, I have concluded that the wings are of sufficient scale to ensure that the overhang does not diminish appreciation of the Farmhouse's principal elevation.
16. Moreover, an earlier phase of works included the central porch between the two gabled wings and this also extends across the front elevations, albeit to a lesser extent.
17. Whilst I acknowledge that the development and works have not been approved, I have concluded that they do not cause harm to the character and local distinctiveness of the Farmhouse. Nor do they have an adverse effect on the significance of the Farmhouse, for the reasons set out above. As such I conclude that the development and works preserve the special historic and architectural interest of the Farmhouse. They are not in conflict with Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy which is concerned with the protection and enhancement of historic assets, or Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework which has similar objectives.

#### *Other matters*

18. The Council has raised concerns in relation to the inaccuracy of the drawings and I agree that there are discrepancies. However, I have based my reasoning on what I observed at the inspection.

*Conditions*

19. The Council has not suggested any conditions in the event that the appeal is allowed. As the development and works are built and provide their own record, I see no reason to impose any.

**Conclusions – Appeals A and B**

20. Whilst I acknowledge the Council's concerns, I have concluded that the development and works would preserve the Farmhouse's special architectural and historic interest. Appeals A and B are allowed, and planning permission and listed building consent are granted.

*A Edgington*

INSPECTOR