

Appeal made against the refusal of planning permission

Appeal reference	APP/P1805/D/11/2148797
Planning Application	10/1202-SG
Proposal	Single storey lean-to extension (dining room) to replace previous lean-to element of original barn
Location	Oak Tree Barn, 1 Brickhouse Lane, Stoke Prior, Bromsgrove, B60 4LX
Ward	Stoke Prior
Decision	Refused 23.11.2010

The author of this report is Stacey Green who can be contacted on 01527 881342 (e-mail: s.green@bromsgrove.gov.uk) for more information.

Discussion

The proposal was for a single storey lean-to extension (dining room) to a replace previous lean-to element of original barn.

The application was determined under delegated powers and refused on the basis of its form and design in relation to the character and appearance of the original building and harm to the Green Belt in terms of inappropriateness. The two reasons for refusal are noted below:

1. The siting, form and design of the proposed extension would detrimentally erode the simple form and utilitarian character and appearance of the original building contrary to Policy DS2 and C27C of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan; the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 4 'The Conversion of Rural Buildings' and Policy D.16 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan.
2. The proposed extension would be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt and no very special circumstances have been put forward to justify it. Therefore, the proposal conflicts with policies D38 and D39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan, policy DS2 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and the advice of PPG2.

The Inspector notes Policy C27C of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan which states that proposals for extensions to converted rural buildings will be assessed against the impact of the scheme on the character of the original building as it existed immediately prior to conversion, rather than the use to which it has been converted. With this in mind, the Inspector gives significant weight to the photographic evidence presented by the applicant which showed that the space

to be occupied by the proposed lean-to extension was formerly occupied by an open sided lean-to of greater footprint. The Inspector considers that the lean-to had been an integral part of the barn prior to its conversion to a dwelling. The Inspector concludes that the extension would not harm the plain, simple and utilitarian appearance of the original building, whether assessed against the style and appearance of the original building, or as subsequently converted to a dwelling.

With regard to the Green Belt, the Inspector noted that the proposed extension would only be visible in an arc of views from the east south-east around to the south-west. In all these views the lean-to would be viewed against the taller and more extensive L-shaped barn which comprises the existing dwelling. There would be no material increase in the visual width of the barn and the proposed lean-to extension would have no detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

The Inspector has regard to paragraph 3.4 of PPG2 that indicates that limited extensions to existing dwellings (subject to paragraph 3.6 of PPG2) are not inappropriate development. The Inspector gives weight to the photographic evidence that the space to be occupied by the proposed lean-to extension was formerly occupied by an open-sided lean-to of greater size than that now proposed to be constructed. The Inspector therefore considered that the proposed lean-to extension will not, therefore, result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. Moreover, as an extension of modest size, it can reasonably be considered to be a limited extension to the existing dwelling. The Inspector did not therefore consider the proposal to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Costs application

No application for costs was made.

Appeal outcome

The appeal was **ALLOWED**.

Recommendation

The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that the item of information be noted.