



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2024

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/D/23/3330726

Slade Farm, Threshing Barn, Buckingham Road, West Northamptonshire, Evenley, NN13 5SB

- 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 Dr Clacey and Dr Robertson against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/5682/FULL, dated 3 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey glass room located on the rear elevation to the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey glass room located on the rear elevation to the property at Slade Farm, Threshing Barn, Buckingham Road, West Northamptonshire, Evenley, NN13 5SB in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 2023/5682/FULL, dated 3 May 2023 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be commenced 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: block plan (35829-06), proposed plans (35829 – 03) and proposed elevations (35829-04);
 - 3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall be as set out within the details outlined within the application form and the design and access statement and are to be maintained as such for the lifetime of the development. Any variations must be agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority prior to installation.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the determination of the application and submission of this appeal a revised National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (the Framework) had been revised in response to the Levelling-Up and Regeneration Bill: reforms to national planning policy consultation on 19 December 2023. The refusal reason does not, however, reference the Framework and it is not considered that this impacts upon the determination of this appeal given the main changes to the Framework and the main issues before me.

Main Issue

3. The main issue within this appeal is the impact of the proposal upon the traditional form and layout of the original rural building.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a barn conversion which is part of three dwellings created from the original farm layout. The conversion was noted to have been accommodated within the existing built form and I acknowledge that the original openings, in this case a large opening in the rear elevation, have been maintained. In the case of the property before me, the large opening is one of the main features in the rear elevation which draws back to the traditional agricultural character of the building.
5. The Council make reference, within their delegated report, to a glazed rear extension which is stated to have been originally refused, dismissed at appeal (S/2013/1712/FUL), and then granted under an amended submission (S/2014/1950/FUL). These proposals/applications relate to the adjacent barn conversion (The Dovecote). I note that the Council has submitted copies of the delegated reports, decisions and the appeal decision, however, the submissions before me fail to include copies of the relevant plans to allow me to relate to the commentary made by both the Council and the Inspector in each case in relation to refusal/dismissal and then approval as noted.
6. Despite this, from the photographs provided, by the appellant, it would appear that the commentary which resulted in the proposal being dismissed at appeal was as a result of the proposed rear glazed veranda seeking to extend beyond the existing single storey lean-to which is present at The Dovecote. The scheme, next door, as built and approved allows the roof to continue the same line and pitch as the existing building and the extension itself is in line with the rear wall of the adjacent building (the existing single storey lean-to).
7. Overall, whilst I note the schemes and commentary in relation to the adjacent property, the characteristics of the appeal site before me are different due to it not having an existing single storey lean-to. I do not, however, find that this means that the scheme would create an entirely new rear elevation as, due to its entirely glazed design, the main feature of the rear elevation (the existing large opening) would remain visible (notwithstanding that it may be partially obscured at low level by furnishing). The materials would result in a suitable contrast which would not, visually, compete nor attempt to present as an original feature and would clearly maintain the host barn's visual dominance. In addition, the proposal would be positioned within an enclosed private rear garden area which would be limited in wider views within the context of the surrounding countryside.
8. The proposal would result in differing materials than the original barn, however, given the presence of the approved glazed veranda on the adjacent property, these would not now be uncharacteristic for the setting of the appeal site. I find that the design of the proposal has been, largely, informed by the need to be consistent with the dimensions of the existing glazed opening in the rear elevation to allow this to be maintained as an original feature in visual terms. This has, in turn, dictated the roof pitch which is possible due to a need to connect to the host property at the eaves to fit around the existing glazing at first floor level. The proposal, from the side elevation, would result in a

slightly different roof pitch than the steep pitch found on the original barn itself, however, I do not find that it would be at such odds with the angle of other roofs within the vicinity that it would warrant refusal in this case.

9. The proposed, single storey glass room, by virtue of its design, materials and siting on the dwelling, would not appear incongruous nor unsympathetic to the traditional form any layout of the original rural building. The proposal would be consistent with South Northamptonshire Part 2 Local Plan (2011 – 2029) Policy SS2 which confirms that planning permission will be granted where the proposed development uses a design-led approach to demonstrate compatibility and integration with its surroundings and the distinctive local character. The proposal would also be consistent with Policy SDP1 which requires that proposals for extensions to dwellings in the open countryside should be appropriate to their context. In this case, I find that the proposal, for the reasons set out, is appropriate to the context and character of the existing building as a traditional stone barn conversion.
10. The South Northamptonshire Council Residential Design Guide in the Countryside (Planning Guidance Notes) is noted to state (3.2) that new extensions, additions, or outbuildings should normally match the parent building. It is key, I find, that the wording states *normally* (my emphasis), which I find means there may be some cases where not matching the parent building is appropriate. In the case, which is before me, an extension which matches the parent building (in terms of material) would be entirely inappropriate as it would then obscure the key feature, which is created by the existing large, glazed, opening in the rear elevation. This feature is key to the conversion reading as a former agricultural barn. The use of glazing as a result of the proposal does, in this case, allow extension, but in a manner which allows the original features of the host property to be visually maintained.
11. I note that within the appeal decision submitted by the Council in relation to The Dovecote (APP/Z2830/D/14/2218505) the Inspector had regard for the same guidance. It was also specifically acknowledged that that document advised that additions should normally match the parent building, and the character of rural buildings should be retained. Despite this, the Inspector, within that appeal on the adjacent property, found that a simple glazed structure maybe acceptable on the building subject to it being of satisfactory design and size. It is key, therefore, that the Inspector, in that appeal, did not object to the proposal based upon the materials (glazing) in that case either when taking into account the relevant design guidance.

Conditions

12. The Council have suggested three conditions, within their questionnaire. which I have considered and applied as appropriate. A time condition is attached to comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. A condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the approved plans is required to control and define the development which is granted consent.
13. In this case a condition requiring the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development cannot be conditioned to match the existing building – the proposal seeks consent for a single storey glass room as an extension to a traditional stone/tiled barn. I have, therefore, conditioned the proposal to be in accordance with the materials set out within the

application form and the submitted design and access statement. The latter document is noted to propose RAL 7002 Olive Grey posts and profiles with a clear glazed roof and glass elements.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR