The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 20 February 2012

by Elizabeth Hill BSc(Hons), BPhil, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 March 2012

Appeal A: APP/K2420/A/11/2166429
Church Farm, The Green, Orton-on-the-Hill, Atherstone, CV9 3NG

- 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 David Newman against the decision of Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council.
- The application Ref 11/00606/FUL, dated 22 July 2011, was refused by notice dated 17 October 2011.
- The development proposed is the erection of a single storey extension to provide a utility room to the farmhouse.

Appeal B: APP/K2420/E/11/2166551
Church Farm, The Green, Orton-on-the-Hill, Atherstone, CV9 3NG

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
- The appeal is made by Mr David Newman against the decision of Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council.
- The application Ref 11/00630/LBC, dated 22 July 2011, was refused by notice dated 17 October 2011.
- The works proposed are the erection of a single storey extension to provide a utility room to the farmhouse.

Decisions:

1. **Appeal A**: The appeal is dismissed.

2. **Appeal B**: The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue for both appeals is: the effect of the proposed works on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

Reasons

4. The buildings at Church Farm originally formed a courtyard, as shown on old maps submitted with the appeal. Only one main thatched wing of mediaeval origin remains, which has been extended, and the listing description for the Grade II listed building relates to that wing. A southern wing to the property has been formed by linking a single storey outbuilding to the main building and it is to this wing that the proposed extension would be attached. Other changes to the site since 2000 include: the renovation of another former outbuilding to the front of the property; the building of a new garage block to the rear; and, the re-instatement of a former pond and building of a tennis court.

5. The special interest and significance of the listed building derives from its simple linear form relating back to its mediaeval origins and its historic courtyard form of development. The extensions to the older part of the farm building, including the southern wing, have been sympathetic in retaining the simple linear form and historic courtyard formation of the buildings. The proposed extension, although set back from the front of the house, would be a sizable projection, some 4.8m from the side wall of the wing, disrupting its linear, rectangular form, and be an incongruous addition to it. The appellant has submitted maps which show development in this area of the site which is claimed to be larger than that proposed for the extension. The older maps show walls projecting from the side of the southern wing but it is not clear whether they ever formed part of a building or were only an open enclosure. As such, it is not possible to say whether this structure would have had the same visual impact in terms of its height and bulk as the proposal.

6. The newer parts of the reconstructed southern wing have used mainly reclaimed brick and tile and the materials to be used in the extension would be similar to, and in keeping with, these materials. The windows would also be in keeping with those of the southern wing. However, these differ from those of the older wing, which are squarer with smaller panes, and do not have the blue brick cills of the windows in the extension. The existing southern wing is not seen in the context of the older wing in views from the front of the dwelling. However, the proposed window in facing approximately north-east would be seen in the context of the front elevation of the main wing to the house, and would be seen as incongruent with it. In addition, the proposed bargeboard on the gable to the extension would be an alien feature, out of keeping with the other gables on the dwelling, which are without such additions.

7. Of the other two outbuildings on the site, one is a refurbished farm building, the features of which are in keeping with the older wing of the house when seen from the front of the dwelling. The new garage block, with accommodation over it, is set well back on the site with tall hedging and other vegetation intervening in views from the front of the dwelling. Therefore these outbuildings are separate from, and preserve the setting of, the listed building. In contrast, the proposed extension would be attached to the building and seen in views from the front of the site, across lower hedges. It would impinge into an area which is currently open and forms part of the setting, although it is not claimed by the Council that its use as a garden area has any historical significance. Nevertheless, the proposed works would harm the architectural form and significance of the listed building.

8. In the absence of any public benefit to outweigh this harm, I conclude that the proposed works would conflict with the guidance in Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5): Planning for the Historic Environment and would not preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and its setting. As such, the proposal would be contrary to saved policies BE4 and BE5 of Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan (2001), which seek to ensure that alterations to listed buildings preserve their architectural and historic interest and preserve their setting and policy HE7.4 of PPS5, which requires decision-makers to take into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets.

9. The site lies within Orton-on-the-Hill Conservation Area (CA) and, as part of Appeal A, the effect of the proposed development on its character and

appearance also needs to be assessed. Church Farm lies in the older part of the village just off the green and near the church, where there are a scatter of older buildings. The drive to the dwelling is relatively well screened by vegetation and the proposal would be set back on the site, limiting the effect on the appearance of the CA. However, Church Farm, as an historic building, forms an intrinsic element of the character of the CA, which would be harmed by the proposal. As such, it would fail to preserve the character of Orton-on-the-Hill CA and be contrary to policy HE7.4 of PPS5.

Conclusions

10. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

E A Hill

INSPECTOR