

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

13th February 2013

APPEAL OUTCOME REPORT FOR INFORMATION

**APPEAL MADE AGAINST REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION AND
REFUSAL OF LISTED BUILDING CONSENT**

PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS 2011/183/FUL

LBC APPLICATION DETAILS 2011/184/LBC

**PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT OF SINGLE DWELLING WITH
ANCILLARY ACCOMMODATION WITHIN
RECONSTRUCTED LISTED BARNs**

**LOCATION BARNs AT BRICKHOUSE FARM, BROOKHOUSE LANE,
HAM GREEN, REDDITCH**

WARD ASTWOOD BANK & FECKENHAM

**DECISION DECISION MADE BY OFFICERS UNDER DELEGATED
POWERS ON 29TH NOVEMBER 2011**

The author of this report is Steven Edden, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on extension 3206 (e-mail: steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) for more information.

Discussion

The case related to the reconstruction of two Grade II listed barns to form a single dwelling and ancillary accommodation. Both planning and listed building consent applications were refused for the following reason:

1. The site is identified in the Development Plan for the area as falling within the Green Belt where there is a presumption against inappropriate development. In such an area, development is limited to that which is not inappropriate to a Green Belt and which would preserve its openness. The proposed rebuilding works would amount to inappropriate development, which by definition, is harmful to the Green Belt. The Council considers that no very special circumstances have been put forward to overcome the harm to the Green Belt. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy B(RA).1 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3

Officers sought to defend this reason through written representations to the Planning Inspector.

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

13th February 2013

The site lies in the rural countryside at Ham Green, which is designated as Green Belt and proposed to convert two barns which are included in the listed building schedule as Grade II listed. Planning permission and listed building consent were granted in 2001 for the conversion of the two barns to three dwellings. These were not implemented and in 2006, applications to renew them were refused, one of the reasons being that the continuing deterioration of the barns and the nature of the proposals meant that the works went beyond what would normally be acceptable for re-use of buildings in the Green Belt. However, in 2007, permission was granted for the conversion of the larger barn to a single dwelling with the smaller barn providing ancillary accommodation. Again, this was not implemented.

Following her site inspection, the Inspector noted that the larger barn had collapsed and that it had been reduced to a pile of broken timbers, bricks and tiles, lying where they fell. The Inspector, like Officers therefore considered that the proposals would have resulted in new build development rather than a conversion. Although superficially similar to the former barn, the Inspector agreed with Officers that the resultant new dwelling could not re-gain all of the now lost original intrinsic architectural and historic value of the barn and that the appearance of a new dwelling would adversely affect the character of its rural setting.

The Inspector noted that the smaller of the two barns was still standing although in need of repair. She stated that while the proposal would preserve this building, it would not be the only means by which its preservation could be achieved and that its conversion under the appeal proposal was dependent upon a decision concerning the larger barn.

She found that the advice given within the now adopted National Planning Policy Framework on Green Belts is consistent with Policy B(RA).1 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan under which the decision to refuse was made, and concluded that the appeal proposal was for a new dwelling in the Green Belt which would be inappropriate development as set out in the NPPF and Local Plan Policy B(RA).1.

The Inspector found that no other considerations in this case clearly outweighed the harm identified and that the *very special circumstances* necessary to justify the development did not exist.

Appeal outcome

The appeals were DISMISSED. Costs were neither sought nor awarded.

Recommendation

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