
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025

by **N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R2520/D/24/3355150

Willow Farm, Dunston Fen, Metheringham, Lincoln, Lincolnshire, LN4 3AG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Sue Gretton against the decision of North Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0509/HOUS.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing derelict outbuilding and erection of 2 storey extension to existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the above banner heading has been taken from the decision notice and appeal form as this concisely describes the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to Willow Farm which is a two-storey detached property converted from a former barn. It is located in the open countryside in spacious surrounds. The property is built in stone and brick with a pantile roof and grey windows and doors. Adjacent to the dwelling to the southwest is a former barn built with concrete blocks and corrugated sheeting to roof and walls.
5. The existing single storey barn is of a large size although the building has a gable ended pitched roof and the ridge of the existing barn comes halfway up the existing roof of the dwelling. This gives it a relatively subservient appearance in relation to the existing dwelling.
6. The proposed development seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing detached barn and its replacement by the erection of an attached two storey extension to the existing dwelling. It is acknowledged that the proposed extension would replace an existing structure of a similar footprint, but the overall scale and massing would be significantly greater. The overall height of the extension has been reduced during the course of the application to match the ridge height of the existing dwelling. However, the eaves height of the extension would still be at full two storey height which would result in an extension that would

not appear as a subservient and sympathetic extension in relation to the host dwelling. It would be an unduly dominant addition against the scale and massing of the existing dwelling.

7. Further, and even considering the materials, the design of the proposed extension fails to respond to the rural character and appearance of the structure it proposes to replace and its wider rural locality. It also fails to respond positively to the rural character of the dwelling which has largely been retained through its conversion from a former agricultural building. The extension would be more visible from the adjoining roads than the existing barn given its overall greater scale and massing and would be at odds with the scale, character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider rural locality.
8. The extension would replace a dilapidated building and provide improved accommodation whilst maximising the sites potential. I am also aware that the building is no longer fit for purpose nor meet the needs of the residents. Even so, I cannot agree that the proposed development would be an improvement nor positive addition to the site, and I do not find the overall appearance of the existing building to be so unsightly as to benefit from the proposals. It merely appears as an agricultural barn in a rural setting which is a characteristic of this context. Larger buildings may be more common in rural settings, but this would not alter my findings as the proposed development would still appear at odds with the scale, character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its wider rural locality.
9. For the above reasons, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2023 and to paragraphs 131, 135 and 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as design characteristics C1, C2 and I1 of the National Design Guide.
10. I am aware of other policies referred to such as the efficient use of land, but the proposed development would still need to comply with the above policies which this scheme does not. It therefore conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole.

Other Matters

11. Willow Farm may not be listed nor be within the Conservation Area or covered by an Article 4 direction, but this would not alter my findings on the above main issue. There would be some minor economic benefits from the proposed development particularly during construction along with some social and environmental benefits but the extent to which this would be beneficial is limited by the small-scale nature of the proposals and would not outweigh the harm identified. I also note the matters which are not in dispute, but this is a neutral factor in my decision.
12. The appellant explains that they would accept relevant conditions to render the proposal acceptable but have not suggested what these could be. I have determined this scheme based on the plans provided and I have identified the harm that would arise. I do not therefore find the use of planning conditions to be appropriate in overcoming this harm.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that would outweigh the identified harm and associated plan conflict. I conclude that the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR