
Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 23/12/16

gan Joanne Burston BSc MA MRTPI

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 01.02.2017

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23/12/16

by Joanne Burston BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 01.02.2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E6840/D/16/3164934

Site address: Highway Barn, Common Road, Mitchel Troy NP25 4JB

The Welsh Ministers have transferred the authority to decide this appeal to me as the appointed Inspector.

- 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 Stuart Maidment against the decision of Monmouthshire County Council.
 - The application Ref DC/2016/00917, dated 02 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey lean-to extension on the western (rear) elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey lean-to extension on the western (rear) elevation at Highway Barn, Common Road, Mitchel Troy NP25 4JB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/2016/00917, dated 02 August 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development shall begin not later than five years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: 01 (Location and site plan); 02 (Existing elevations and plans); 03 (Proposed elevations and plans); 04 (Existing isometric drawing); 05 (Existing isometric drawing); 06 (Existing isometric drawing); 07 (Existing isometric drawing); 08 (Proposed isometric drawing); 09 (Proposed isometric drawing); 10 (Proposed isometric drawing); and 11 (Proposed isometric drawing).
 - 3) The Oak trees shall be protected in accordance with the recommendations laid down in Section 6 of the BS 5837 Survey and Arboricultural Method Statement prepared by Broadway Tree Consultancy dated July 2016.

Procedural Matter

2. I have considered the duty to improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales, in accordance with the sustainable development principle, under section 3 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 ("the WCFG Act"). In reaching this decision, I have taken into account the ways of working set out
-

at section 5 of the WCFG Act and I consider that this decision is consistent with the sustainable development principle as required by section 8 of the WCFG Act.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding Wye Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Reasons

4. The development proposed is a single storey rear extension to a converted barn situated on a small raised plateau above the rural settlement of Mitchel Troy Common, in the Wye Valley AONB. The barn is a small well-formed building retaining much of its previous agricultural form through a sympathetic conversion.
5. The dwelling, which fronts a quiet single track access lane, is surrounded by undulating fields and small pockets of woodland. There are also a number of designated public rights of way within close proximity of the appeal site. Despite the barn conversion being situated on reasonably high ground, it is not a prominent feature in the landscape and there are only glimpsed views of the rear elevation from the public domain.
6. In order to protect the special qualities of the countryside Monmouthshire Local Development Plan 2014 (LDP) Policy H4 broadly requires that only modest extensions should be allowed to rural properties and that development should respect the rural character and design of the host building, especially if located in the AONB. To support his case the appellant has brought to my attention Supplementary Planning Guidance titled '*Replacement Dwellings in the Open Countryside and Extensions of Rural Dwellings in the Countryside*' (SPG). However, as established in paragraph 2.7 of the SPG, the guidance is not relevant to extensions to dwellings that have been converted from other buildings, such as barns. In such cases the criteria set out in LDP Policy H4 would continue to apply.
7. The proportions, height, size and scale of the proposal respects that of the host property. Consequently it would appear as a subordinate addition to the barn. The design of the extension and the size and details of fenestration would reflect that of the barn and the plans indicate that it would utilise materials to match those on the existing buildings. Overall, the proposed extension respects the simple design of the converted barn and would blend satisfactorily into the rural AONB landscape.
8. I acknowledge that the barn conversion already benefits from a planning permission¹ for an extension, which has now been implemented. Nevertheless, even when this extension is considered alongside that proposed they would not be excessive. In my opinion they would be appropriately scaled modest additions that would continue the strength of the stonework and detailing found in the original barn, would not detract from the barns linear form and would not add an unacceptable amount of mass. Therefore, the cumulative effect of the extensions would not significantly affect the charm, character and setting of the existing building.

¹ Planning permission ref DC/2007/00563

9. I also note that a previous appeal² for an extension at the appeal site was dismissed. However, that extension was a curved single storey design, with basement, situated on the principle elevation of the barn. In that case the Inspector stated that it would overwhelm the host dwelling and would result in the loss of the traditional character and appearance of the former agricultural building. Accordingly the circumstances of the previous appeal are not directly comparable with those that apply in this appeal. I have in any case reached my own conclusions on the appeal proposal on the basis of the evidence before me.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area, and it would preserve the special landscape character, heritage and distinctiveness of the AONB. As such it would not conflict with the LDP Policies S13, S17, H4, LC4, DES1 and EP1 which seek to ensure that development conserves and enhances the landscape of the Wye Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), is of a high standard of design and respects the rural character and distinctiveness of the area.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard conditions which impose a time limit on the commencement of development and direct that development takes place in accordance with the approved plans, the Council has suggested a further condition in the event the appeal succeeds.
12. In the interests of preserving the character of the surrounding area, I have imposed a condition to protect the oak trees in accordance with the recommendations laid down in Section 6 of the BS 5837 Survey and Arboricultural Method Statement prepared by Broadway Tree Consultancy dated July 2016.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions as set out above.

Joanne Burston

INSPECTOR

² Appeal decision ref APP/E6840/A/15/3133005