



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2022 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by David M H Rose BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C3430/D/21/3288361

4 Whitehall Farm Barns Wolverhampton Road, Himley DY3 4LB

- 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 Alan Mullett against the decision of South Staffordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00884/FUL, dated 6 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear orangery (garden room).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The site is located within the Green Belt and the Council concluded that given the scale of the proposal it would not be a disproportionate addition to the original building and thus the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Given the scale of the proposal and based on the information before me, I agree that the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance of the converted agricultural building, as a whole.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Whitehall Farm Barns is a group of agricultural buildings that have been converted and divided into smaller dwellings and No 4 is one of the two central dwellings within the central barn. The barn is a narrow building and is constructed from exposed brick with a brown clay tiled roof. Overall, the barn has been sympathetically converted and has retained many of the traditional agricultural features with relatively limited areas of glazing, notwithstanding the south elevation of No 5.
6. It would appear from the evidence provided that the rear of the barns, prior to conversion, followed a consistent line other than a relatively small single storey

projection, under a tiled gable roof, at what is now No 3. The end barn, No 5, has a later much larger rearward projection, in matching brickwork and under a tiled roof. In total, the barns retain much of their agrarian character and appearance.

7. By contrast the appeal proposal, although small in scale and under a tiled roof, would have two of its three elevations constructed in oak framed glazing. In my opinion, these latter elements would be inconsistent with the robust character and appearance of the host property and the group as a whole. On this basis, I find that the proposed extension would be alien to the building's history and interest.
8. Moreover, the oak framing and extent of glazing do not give any impression of adaptation of a former traditional structure. Whilst this style of extension has been used on other converted agricultural buildings elsewhere, each case must be assessed on their own merits and in this instance, this style of extension would not respect the appearance of the building.
9. Furthermore, the two existing projections are a similar height, albeit with different pitches, whereas the proposed extension would be much shorter than both. The similar roof height shows a consistency in the development of the barn and the scale of the proposal would not replicate the building's history and interest. This would emphasise the discordant appearance of the proposal.
10. Therefore, the scale and appearance of the extension would harm the appearance of the converted agricultural building, as a whole. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Policies EQ3, EQ4 and EQ11 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted 2012). These policies expect development to respect local character and distinctiveness including that of the surrounding development and landscape.

Other Matters

11. I have a statutory duty to consider the effect of the proposal on heritage assets. The site is located within the Himley Village and Parkland Conservation Area (CA). The CA covers a wide area with the parkland around Himley Hall occupying the largest portion of the CA. The site and the surrounding buildings have a distinct character separate from the parkland around Himley Hall and are separated by the A449. The contribution these dwellings make to the significance of this elements of the CA comes from the dispersed pattern of development that is typical in rural settlements alongside the traditional appearance of the buildings.
12. Whitehall Farm Barns are consistent with this insofar as the barns are traditional agricultural buildings that have been sensitively converted. Whilst the design of the proposal would harm the appearance of the building, the proposal would be located away from most public viewpoints to the rear of the building. Given the very limited scale of the proposal in relation to the wider CA, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA, as a whole.
13. The proposal would create a larger home to accommodate the appellant's family, including family members who live elsewhere but at times would need respite that the larger home would allow for. Whilst I have taken account of

these personal circumstances, they do not outweigh the harm that the proposal would cause to the appearance of the building.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. The proposed extension would not accord with the development plan as a whole and for the reasons given above, there are no material considerations that indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

David MH Rose

INSPECTOR