



## Appeal Decision

---

by Helen Smith BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 13/06/2024

Appeal reference: CAS-03375-V9V7H5

Site address: Ishton Barn, Lon Cwrt Ynyston, Leckwith, CF11 8DR

---

- 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 and Mrs Stuart and Jo Pyman against the decision of The Vale of Glamorgan Council.
  - The application Ref 2023/01141/FUL, dated 14 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 16 January 2024.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a garden annex with a glazed connection to the existing structure.
  - A site visit was made on 3 June 2024.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building and the locality.

### Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a dwelling located in the countryside and the Cwrt-Yr-Ala Basin Special Landscape Area (SLA). The existing dwelling forms the central link of a group of 'U' shaped converted stone barns. This group of buildings are positioned around a central courtyard area and consists of 3 dwellings including the appeal site, Istwyn Barn and Eston Barn. The building complex is located at the end of a private road with Ynyston Farmhouse and Ty Llaeth opposite the courtyard. Ishton Barn is a single storey linear building and whilst it was rebuilt during its conversion, it has retained its simple traditional rural character and forms an integral part of the wider group of rural barns. It has a large rear garden at a lower level than the dwelling, accessed by a set of steps from French doors in the rear elevation. The garden is well screened from the surrounding countryside by a high mature hedge on its southern boundary and includes several small scale outbuildings and a pergola. Eston Barn has been extended on its eastern elevation, however, given its modest scale and sympathetic form and materials, this does not detract from the simple rural character of the complex of former farm

buildings. The rear extension at Ty Llaeth relates to a detached building and does not form part of the complex of buildings that the appeal relates to. Consequently, this extension does not inform the character of the group of buildings and is not viewed in the context of the appeal proposal.

4. Policy MD11 of the Vale of Glamorgan Local Development Plan (LDP) relates to the conversion and renovation of rural buildings, and its supporting text says conversions must be sympathetic to their location. Whilst the policy, and supporting advice set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 'The Conversion and Renovation of Rural Buildings' primarily relates to initial proposals for the re-use of rural buildings, the SPG clarifies that the guidance and policy MD11 is equally applicable to subsequent applications to extend or alter rural buildings that have already been converted. It advises that, where justified, minor additions may be acceptable where this is designed with sensitivity for the existing building. It continues to advise that favourable consideration will be given to glazed lightweight extensions which retain the distinction between 'old' and 'new' and that where an extension is deemed acceptable it should be subordinate in scale to the existing building and respectful in its design detailing to the parent building.
5. LDP policy MD12 also seeks to, amongst other things, ensure that dwellings in the countryside, as extended, are not disproportionate in size to the original dwelling, and would not unacceptably affect the character of the existing dwelling and its contribution to rural character. Both policies MD11 and MD12 flow from the strategic objectives of LDP Policies SP1 and SP10 to preserve the Vale of Glamorgan's natural and built environment.
6. I note that the appeal proposal follows a previous refusal for planning permission for a single storey extension to the rear of the property (2023/00445/FUL) and that the appellant has sought to address the previous reason for refusal. The appellant has also drawn my attention to a previous appeal decision on this site which allowed a front hall extension but dismissed a rear extension (APP/Z6950/D/18/3214895), which I have had regard to.
7. The square element of the proposal would be set off the rear elevation at an angle to the existing dwelling and linked to it by a long narrow fully glazed extension. This would result in a complex design and appearance which would be in stark contrast to the simple linear form of the existing dwelling. I note that the extension would increase the footprint of the dwelling by around a third, which in itself might seem proportionate. However, this does not reflect the increase in the volume and bulk of built form, and its design, all of which contribute to the visual impact of the development relative to the existing dwelling. In this case, the glazed link would limit works to the rear fabric of the building, and the contemporary appearance and lightweight materials of the proposal would enable a distinction between the 'old' and the 'new'. However, relative to the simple proportions of the existing dwelling, the height and length of the glazed link combined with the square bulk of the extension and its unusual design would result in a visually dominant development that is out of scale and character with the existing dwelling. I do not consider that the removal of the steps and raised terrace and the exposure of the original stone beneath would mitigate the proposal's impact. Consequently, the proposal would be an unsympathetic and disproportionate addition which would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property.
8. Given that the dwelling forms an integral part of the former barn complex, the proposal would also be at odds with simple 'U' form of the group of the traditional rural buildings. This would erode their character and diminish their modest visual impact which presently preserves the rural character and appearance of the area.

9. I accept that owing to the mature hedge on the southern boundary, the proposal would not be visibly prominent from the wider landscape. I also consider that the harm I have identified would be localised and as such there would be no adverse impacts on the special qualities of the wider SLA. Nevertheless, the harm would still exist, and this would not therefore be a reason for allowing an unacceptable development.
10. The appellants have drawn my attention to a recent appeal decision allowing a new single storey extension on the site of a former agricultural building (CAS-03053-G4K9X0). I accept that there are similarities between this proposal and the appeal proposal in that they both relate to a contemporary designed extension to a converted barn linked by a glazed extension. However, whilst the original building of Ty Isaf is linear in form, it is a detached building, unlike the proposed development, and therefore has a different context. For these reasons I do not consider that the proposals are directly comparable. The appellant has also cited an example of a contemporary extension at Hurdle House in Hampshire, however, the full circumstance of that case is not before me and so I cannot be sure that the circumstances are the same. I have therefore determined the appeal on its own merits.
11. I conclude that the proposal would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and the locality, contrary to policies MD11, MD12 of the LDP and the SPG. It would also be contrary to LDP policy MD2 which seeks to, amongst other things, ensure that development proposals are of a high standard of design that positively contributes to the context and character of the surrounding natural and built environment.

#### **Other Matter**

12. I have had regard to the appellants' personal circumstances and their need to provide additional space. However, the harm that I have identified would be significant and would be likely to remain in posterity. This does not therefore lead me to alter my decision.

#### **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.
14. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the requirements of sections 3 and 5 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015. I consider that this decision is in accordance with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Ministers' well-being objectives.

*H Smith*

INSPECTOR