



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2024

by J Somers BSocSci (Planning) MA (HEC) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State.

Decision date: 12.03.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P3040/D/23/3333909

The Old Grain Store, Barnstone Lodge Farm, Works Lane, Barnstone, NN13 9JN

- 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 Mark Shouler and Mrs Catherine Shouler against the decision of Rushcliffe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01703/FUL, dated 7 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 2 new extensions to the North West of the property and associated internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the proposal as noted on the Application Form and the Council's Decision Notice states 'internal alterations.' Internal alterations do not constitute 'development' and will not be assessed within this letter, with the only consideration around the two extensions proposed to the appeal property.
3. I note that both parties in their appeal documents reference the paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework). Since the submission of the appeal, the 2021 version of the Framework has been superseded by the 2023 version. The wording of the paragraphs of the new Framework relevant to this appeal remain unchanged from the 2021 version (except for new paragraph numbers) and therefore did not require to be reassessed by either party in relation to this appeal. I have considered the appeal on this basis and refer only to the updated 2023 Framework within my decision.

Main Issue

4. Taking the above into account, the main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the existing building, as well as the surrounding locality.

Reasons

5. In determining applications involving character and appearance, Policy 1 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (LPP2) and Policy 10 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy (CS) are both design policies which set a number of design principles for assessing appropriateness such as ensuring scale, density, height, massing, design, layout and materials of the

- proposal is sympathetic to the character and appearance of neighbouring buildings and the surrounding area. Additionally the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) reinforces these design principles, such as paragraph 135 which seeks that decisions that are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.
6. The appeal site is a historic barn which forms part of a historic farmstead which lies to the north of a main farmhouse called Barnstone Lodge. The barn buildings extend from the rear of Barnstone Lodge and form an inverted U-shape around a courtyard which is situated relatively isolated from other surrounding development amongst agricultural fields surrounding. All of the historic barns have since been converted to dwellings, however they retain their strong linear and functional forms and construction, quality of materials and craftsmanship, and the relationship to their traditional construction and former form and function as largely unaltered agricultural buildings. The character is also defined by their location within agricultural surroundings; the association of the barns to each other, where the buildings have a functional relationship and are experienced together as a historic agricultural farmstead. This allows an understanding of the various agricultural operations, functions and relationships between the land and associated buildings which is part of the local character and distinctiveness of the area.
 7. The appeal site extends from the rear of Barnstone lodge and is a single storey building that has an inverted T-shape which forms part of the farmstead. Whilst converted to a dwelling, the building has limited openings and maintains a strong linear and functional form and displays a number of the positive characteristics of the local character and distinctiveness of this group of converted agricultural buildings.
 8. As previously discussed, the character and appearance of the barn building relates primarily to its simple linear and functional nature, whilst I agree with the Appellant that there is no street scene to consider here, there is however a clearly defined relationship as to how a farmstead is experienced in which the appeal building plays a significant part. As such, care needs to be taken during alterations in order to avoid excessive domestication of the building and reflecting the simple, linear and functional nature which extends to fenestration and key elevations. The two proposed extensions would be quite large and introduce two gable ends which extend to the north, away from the linear building which extends east to west. Whilst the gabled ends have oak framing, the extensions, together with the large amounts of glazing would sit uncomfortably against the traditional and functional form of the barn.
 9. The extensions would therefore be overly domestic and would not reflect the simplistic and traditional nature of the barn building and overcomplicates the design by the placement of extensions which are uncharacteristic and inauthentic to this particular barn building. Whilst I agree with the Appellant that extensions as a principle can be appropriate for barn buildings and that the removal of permitted development rights is not to prevent all types of development; the proposed extensions are overcomplicated and divert from the strong local character and distinctiveness of this historic farmstead which is the overriding consideration.

10. In conclusion of this matter, the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing building and towards the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to LPP2 Policy 1, and CS Policy 10 as described previously. Additionally the scheme would be contrary to the Framework, in particular paragraph 135.

Other Matters

11. I also note comments within the planning application from an interested party that raises concerns with regards to loss of privacy and overshadowing. Given that the proposal has been found to be contrary to the Development Plan in terms of character and appearance, it has not been necessary to delve into this issue regarding living conditions. I do however note that the Council assessed the scheme as not having sufficient harm to be refused with regards to impact to living conditions.

Conclusion

12. Taking the above into account, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

J Somers

INSPECTOR