



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 May 2025

By S Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/D/25/3361891

Cobshorne Barn, Millthorpe Drove, Millthorpe, Lincolnshire, NG34 0LD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Alexander Richardson against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application reference is S24/1456.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension to the existing dwelling with a single storey glazed link.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension to the existing dwelling with a single storey glazed link at Cobshorne Barn, Millthorpe Drove, Millthorpe, Lincolnshire, NG34 0LD, in accordance with the terms of the application reference S24/1456, subject to the following conditions: -
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:HP24943/02 (proposed plans and elevations); HP24943 (street scenes);HP24943/21(proposed layout plan); HP24943/22(proposed block plan); site plan submitted with the application, and the location plan dated 22 August 2024.

Procedural Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in December 2024 and amended on 7 February 2025 to correct cross references from footnotes 7 and 8, and to amend the end of the first sentence of paragraph 155 to make its intent clear. The 2025 Framework (the Framework) has not materially changed in terms of the identified main issue below and therefore, it has not been necessary for me to seek comments from the main parties.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a single storey, linear, brick barn conversion, set back from the road within a rural setting, characterised by flat agricultural land with a scattering of trees and copses. There is a relatively large, modern building close to it with an agricultural appearance and with wooden boarding. There is also a two-storey brick built dwelling adjoining it but sited closer to the road.
5. The single storey appeal building has a linear form, running away from the road. There is a relatively new belt of tree planting running alongside it to the rear and which is already beginning to obscure the existing building when approaching along the road. When approaching from the other direction, existing mature tree planting and landscaping hides the appeal building to some degree, while additional, new tree planting to its borders is likely to obscure the site even further as it matures.
6. The proposal is to add a two-storey extension to the length of the building with a glass link to the host property. The extension would not be constructed along the whole length but it would have a somewhat greater height.
7. The local planning authority (LPA) considers that the linear form of the existing dwelling is an integral element of its character and appearance and which would be unacceptably harmed by the proposed addition. However, on my site visit I did not find that such a linear form was an obvious characteristic of buildings in the locality. The adjoining agricultural looking building and the two storey original farmhouse next to it cannot be said to be characterised in this way, and I was also able to observe large, bulky agricultural buildings in the vicinity. While the appeal building is attractive and well designed, I do not find that its linear form is such a ubiquitous or traditional form of development in the area so as to be a necessary constraint to any further development.
8. However, if this were to be the case, the linear form of the original barn conversion would, in any event, be retained and visible as part of the development, separated from the main part of the proposed extension by a glazed link. While the link would have a contemporary appearance, its design contrast would ensure that the more traditional appearance of the building were suitably differentiated from it. The blend of old and new would be acceptable in this regard.
9. The height of the proposed extension would exceed that of the existing dwelling and where policy DE1 of the South Kesteven District Local Plan 2020 (LP) requires, amongst other things, that proposals should be of an appropriate scale, density, massing, height and material, given the context of the area, but that context includes the adjoining, taller original farmhouse and the bulkier agricultural type building.
10. Section 6G of the Rutland and South Kesteven Design Guide 2012 (SPD) also stresses the need for extensions to respect the scale and character of the existing dwelling. However, it acknowledges the contents of the Rutland Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance in this regard in that *'it may be possible to have an extension that respects the integrity and character of the original dwelling but is not subordinate such as by being equal to the original in some respects like height and building line'*.
11. While I do not find that the differences in height between the existing dwelling and the proposed extension is so marked as to be fundamentally unacceptable, it is the

case that the tree planting alongside the building and to its borders to which I have referred will help largely to conceal such a difference from the public domain other than at the very site entrance.

12. Therefore, I conclude, on balance, that the proposed development would accord with the fundamental aim of Policy DE1 of the LP which requires development to make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness, vernacular and character of the area, and with both the SPD and chapter 12 of the Framework which require the same.

Conditions

13. I have imposed the standard time condition, and for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty, a condition to ensure that the development is in accordance with the approved plans. In the interests of good design, it is necessary to impose a condition relating to external materials.

Conclusion

14. There are no material planning considerations that indicate that the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be allowed.

.S Hartley

INSPECTOR