

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2024

by Nick Davies BSc(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/W/24/3339035

Muccleshell Farmhouse, Store, Throop Road, Bournemouth BH8 0AJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Frederick Peter Woods (Bournemouth & District Broken Window Co) against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is 7-2023-3396-A.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to the side of the existing warehouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension to the side of the existing warehouse at Muccleshell Farmhouse, Store, Throop Road, Bournemouth BH8 0AJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2023-3396-A, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the building, whether it would preserve the setting of the neighbouring listed building, and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Throop and Muccleshell Villages Conservation Area.

Reasons

Character and appearance of building

3. The appeal building is located on the northwestern edge of Throop, with open agricultural land on three sides. It is a brick-built single storey structure with a high-pitched roof covered in reconstituted slate. It has two tall, hinged timber loading doors, and a third bay is expressed through recessed brickwork, giving the building a balanced appearance. It is set in a hard-surfaced yard surrounded by a 1.8-metre-high brick wall, so is not closely associated with any other buildings. The evidence indicates that it was built in 1994, so is not a historic building. Nevertheless, the materials and proportions of the building give it a rather agricultural character, which means it sits comfortably in its semi-rural location on the edge of the village.

4. The proposed extension would be in the form of a lean-to on the southwest facing gable of the building, within the established yard area and enclosed by the existing boundary wall. This is a logical position for the additional floorspace that is required to enable the expansion of the business. The extension would be of modest proportions compared with the existing building. Its front and rear walls would be set back from those of the host, so that the balanced proportions of the original building would remain legible. Although the pitch of the roof would be shallower, this would reduce its scale, making it a distinctly subservient addition, and allowing the gabled form of the original building to retain its dominance.
5. The extension would be on the side of the building that faces Watery Lane, but it would only be visible from a short stretch of this highway. In these views it would be seen against the much larger gable of the existing building and within the established yard area. Its subservient scale, simple design, and the use of matching materials would make it an unobtrusive and unremarkable addition. Consequently, it would not harm the rather utilitarian character and appearance of the existing building.

Setting of listed building

6. Muccleshell Farmhouse, a Grade II listed building, lies approximately 40 metres to the south of the appeal site. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving this listed building, or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
7. The list description describes the building as a late medieval farmhouse; however, the evidence indicates that it has not been part of a working farm since the 1960s. It is now a private residence set within a domestic garden that contains one of the former agricultural buildings. It is no longer legible as the principal building within a historic farmstead. The appeal site is visually and physically separated from the listed farmhouse, and any functional relationship that the land had with the listed building is no longer legible. The building on the appeal site was constructed after the farmhouse ceased to be part of a working farm, so has no historic association with the listed building. Consequently, neither the appeal site nor the existing building contributes to the significance of the listed building.
8. From the evidence, and from what I saw, the elements of the setting of the building that now make a positive contribution to its significance are its rural location, just beyond the core of the village, and its association with the historic outbuilding within its curtilage, which alludes to its historic function as a farmhouse.
9. Neither the existing building nor the proposed extension would be visible in juxtaposition with the listed building when looking north-westwards along Throop Road. There would, therefore, be no impact on the rural setting of the heritage asset in these views. From a very short stretch of Watery Lane, to the northwest of the appeal site, the two buildings can be seen together. However, only a small portion of the roof of the listed building is visible from here. The extension would be contained within the walled yard, and would be set against the much higher gable of the existing building. It would not, therefore assume any dominance in the street scene, and would not draw the

eye away from the limited part of the listed building that is visible from this point. Furthermore, it would not result in any erosion of the visual or physical separation between the two buildings. Consequently, the proposal would preserve the setting of the listed building.

Conservation Area

10. The site lies within the Throop and Muccleshell Villages Conservation Area (the CA). The significance of this heritage asset lies in the historic buildings that formed part of the original farming community; the more recent planned suburban residential developments; and the rural setting of the settlement that distinguishes it from the larger conurbation to the south.
11. The appeal building is relatively recent, so is not part of the original farming community, and it is not a part of the more recent planned residential developments. The site is almost entirely hard-surfaced, with only some small trees on the northwestern boundary, so it does not play a significant role in the rural setting of the settlement. The building is of a rather utilitarian appearance, and is not visible from a wide range of viewpoints within the CA. Overall, therefore, it makes little contribution to the significance of the CA.
12. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
13. The modest extension to a much larger building, contained within the existing yard, would have little effect on the rural character of this part of the CA. Indeed, it would only be visible from a very small stretch of Watery Lane within the heritage asset, and from here it would be viewed against the more dominant gable end of the existing building. It would not, therefore, be a particularly noticeable addition to the street scene, and would not have a harmful impact on the character or appearance of the CA.
14. The proposal would involve the removal of two small trees. Whilst this would result in some short-term loss of foliage, the evidence from the Council's Tree Officer indicates that the trees are of low quality, and that there is insufficient space for them to achieve maturity. I saw that there was significant planting on the opposite side of the field access, just to the northwest of the building, such that the loss of these two trees would have little impact on the general level of screening in the vicinity. Removal of the trees would allow more space for the remaining oak to grow and to develop a natural crown. Furthermore, the proposal involves the planting of two replacement trees in more suitable locations on the northeastern boundary, together with additional landscaping adjacent to the southwestern boundary. Overall, therefore, the proposals would not result in any harm to the rural character of this part of the CA.
15. To conclude, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the existing building, the setting of the listed building, or the significance of the CA. The development would, therefore, accord with Policies CS39 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012) and saved Policies 3.6 and 4.4 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan (February 2002), insofar as they seek to protect designated heritage assets and achieve high-quality design. The proposal would also accord with the aims

of the National Planning Policy Framework to achieve well-designed and beautiful places, and to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

Conditions

16. In accordance with the legislation, I have imposed a condition limiting the period within which the development must commence. I have also included a condition specifying the relevant plans, as this provides certainty. The Council has suggested two further conditions, relating to materials and landscaping. I have considered them against the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance and agree that they are necessary in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the CA. However, I have altered them, in the interests of clarity and precision, to better reflect the guidance and in the light of the appellant's comments.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nick Davies

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 2301.01A – Location & Block Plan; 2301.02A – Proposed Plan & Elevations; 2301.03A – Existing Plan & Elevations.
- 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
- 4) No development shall take place above ground level until a detailed scheme of landscaping based on Appeal Appendix 13, Landscape Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, identify those to be retained and set out measures for their protection throughout the course of development.

All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the extension or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

End of Schedule