
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 25 April 2017

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15th May 2017

Appeal A Ref: APP/T2350/W/16/3160568

Greengore Farm, Hill Lane, Hurst Green, Clitheroe, BB7 9QT

- 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 Annable against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2016/0369, dated 19 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as an extension to link grade II* listed Greengore with grade II listed Camping Barn, with limited internal alterations.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/T2350/Y/16/3160571

Greengore Farm, Hill Lane, Hurst Green, Clitheroe, BB7 9QT

- 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 and Mrs Annable against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2016/0370, dated 19 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as an extension to link grade II* listed Greengore with grade II listed Camping Barn, with limited internal alterations.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted insofar as it relates to the internal alterations at Greengore and internal alterations and new rooflights at The Flat at Greengore Farm, Hill Lane, Hurst Green, Clitheroe, BB7 9QT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/2016/0369, dated 19 April 2016, subject to the schedule of conditions at the end of these decisions. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed extension.
2. Appeal B is allowed and listed building consent is granted insofar as it relates to the internal alterations at Greengore and internal alterations and new rooflights at The Flat at Greengore Farm, Hill Lane, Hurst Green, Clitheroe, BB7 9QT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/2016/0370, dated 19 April 2016 subject to the schedule of conditions at the end of these decisions. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed extension.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposals on:-

- the special architectural and historic interest of the listed buildings at Greengore and The Flat;
- the character and appearance of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB);

Reasons

Listed buildings

4. In considering proposals for planning permission, the duty imposed by section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special regard must be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of new development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to its conservation. The paragraph goes on to say that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Paragraph 134 requires that where the harm is less than substantial, it should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
5. The development plan includes the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (CS) which was adopted in 2014. Key Statement EN5 and policies DME4 and DMG, in seeking to ensure that developments conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets and encourage a high standard of design, accord with the Framework's requirements.
6. Greengore is a grade II* listed building, whose listing description states that it was built around 1600. The evidence from both parties indicates that the building has historical interest in its associations with the Stonyhurst estate and possible royal connections from its suggested original use as a hunting lodge or shooting box before becoming a farmhouse in the C17th. It also has significance in terms of its age and its rarity as an unusual building with an unconventional single range plan form. Its architectural significance derives from its form and substantial stone-built appearance with mullioned windows in three of its elevations, some with transoms, suggesting a high status building whose principal rooms would have been on the first floor. Its external appearance shows clear evidence of the original building as well as subsequent alterations which have included blocked doorways and five imposing buttresses on the principal and rear elevations. Internally, whilst there are ceiling beams and roof trusses which remain from the original building, there have been many changes over the centuries reflecting its changes in use.
7. The Flat is a grade II listed building to the north west of Greengore, most recently used as a holiday cottage/camping barn. Its historic interest lies in its original use as a former agricultural shippon dating from the C17th and its association with Greengore. Despite some alterations and repairs, it has retained its architectural significance and its simple agricultural character. It has permission and listed building consent for conversion to a two bedroom dwelling.

8. The proposed internal alterations to Greengore include the provision of a downstairs wc and utility room in the existing kitchen and the removal of walls in the existing four bedrooms to create two larger bedrooms. The appellant's heritage statement suggests that the ground floor internal walls date from the late C19th or later. Although English Heritage considers that these form part of the significance of the building, in my view the existing wall between the north hallway and the kitchen contributes little to its significance and its removal would better reveal the original window in the north elevation. This and the creation of new partition walls for a cloak room and wc and a new doorway into the lounge are minor alterations to the rear of the building that would not change the overall layout of the existing main hall or living rooms. The insertion of a new doorway from the lounge to the glazed link to the extension would be immediately to the side of the existing fireplace in the western gable wall. As that wall has been already been altered through external cement rendering, the new opening would not cause significant harm to the fabric of the building. The removal of partition walls at first floor would also better reveal the original window by removing the existing division and would create larger spaces more reflective of the principal rooms that may have existed in its possible former use as a hunting lodge. I conclude, therefore, that the proposed internal alterations would not harm the significance of the listed building.
9. The Council's only objection to the alterations proposed to the listed barn is to the four sets of rooflights. These would be small 'conservation' style rooflights flush with the roof plane. The building was re-roofed and a number of new openings were created when it was converted to a camping barn. Consequently, the new rooflights would have little impact on the significance of the building which would retain its most significant features of randomly spaced small openings and internal kingpost trusses.
10. The proposed extension would provide a kitchen/dining room in a contemporary styled link building between the main house and the barn. Although the rising land to the west provides an attractive backdrop to the buildings, the area is partly occupied by a various small modern structures which detract slightly from the setting of the buildings. Furthermore, the 'open cobbled space' referred to by the Council between the two buildings is substantially patched with concrete and compacted chippings and would be dissected by the previously approved scheme for conversion of the barn to a separate dwelling in any case. I agree, therefore, with Historic England that the principle of a link between the two buildings is an acceptable approach.
11. However, the proposed building is of a considerable size. The appellant's rebuttal statement considers that at 12m it would be shorter in length than the house but this measurement does not take into account the full extent of the overhanging roof and refers only to the length of the walls. Taking account of the overhanging roof it would be slightly longer than the house. It has an excessively wide roof span which would be greater than both those of the house and the barn and its height would be only slightly lower than that of the barn. Thus, in terms of its size and scale it would not appear as a subservient addition to the existing buildings and would be overly dominant. In terms of design detail, its overhanging roof would detract from the simple roof detailing of the barn and would compete with the parapet roof detail of the main house. The stone buttresses would appear contrived and would compete with the imposing buttresses on the house. Moreover, I see no justification for the

number of rooflights in the building given the amount of glazing in the elevations. The new building would be clearly seen from some of the surrounding public footpaths, particularly in a close range view from the footpath which crosses the field to the west of the proposed building and in views towards the property from its access.

12. For these reasons, it would harm the setting of both of the listed buildings, thereby harming their significance. Although in this case the harm would be less than substantial, I must give it considerable importance and weight. I must now assess whether there are any public benefits arising from the proposals that would outweigh the identified harm as required in paragraph 134 of the Framework.
13. Whilst I understand the appellants' wish to create family accommodation that will enable the continued use of the listed buildings and enable the repairs that they consider are necessary, I see no reason why this could not be provided by a much smaller building. The appellants have not provided much detail regarding the repairs they say are necessary other than references to penetrating damp in the barn and significant repairs for Greengore. I have noted that the house was extensively repaired in 1979 and during my visit I saw that it was in generally good condition. I have not been provided with sufficiently compelling evidence to show that the scale of the building proposed is necessary for the continued use of the buildings or for their repair or that there are significant public benefits that would outweigh the harm I have identified. The proposed extension would, therefore, fail to preserve the architectural and historic interest of both of the listed buildings and would conflict with Key Statement EN5 and policies DME4 and DMG.

AONB

14. The Council's policies in Key Statement EN2 and policy DMG2 of the CS seek to protect the character and quality of the AONB and ensure a high quality of design. Decision makers have a statutory duty to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of AONBs which have the highest status of protection and these policies accord broadly with the National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework") which affords them great weight.
15. I am satisfied that for the reasons given earlier regarding the new rooflights in The Flat, these would not harm the character or appearance of the AONB and would accord with the above policies and the Framework.
16. For the reasons given above and as the proposed extension would be clearly seen from public footpaths surrounding the site, it would fail to conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the AONB and would be contrary to Key Statement EN2 and policy DMG2 and to national policy. I have, therefore, attached great weight to this harm in accordance with paragraph 115 of the Framework.

Conditions

17. I agree with the appellant that the level of detail given in the applications and plans is sufficient and that a condition requiring the precise specification of the loss of historic fabric is unnecessary. The suggested conditions for the approval of materials samples and a scheme of archaeological investigation are unnecessary given the nature of the permitted alterations. In addition to the standard time limit and compliance with the plans conditions which are

necessary to provide certainty, a condition for bat surveys and any necessary mitigation measures is necessary in the interests of ecology and because the submitted Bat Building Inspection showed evidence of bats in both buildings.

Conclusion

18. I conclude then that, for the reasons given above, the proposed extension would harm the special architectural and historic interest of the listed buildings at Greengore and The Flat and the character and appearance of the AONB. As such it would not accord with the environmental dimension of sustainability required in the Framework and would not constitute sustainable development. It would be contrary to the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations that would justify determining the appeals otherwise. Both appeals in respect of the proposed extension should be dismissed.
19. For the reasons given earlier, I conclude that the internal alterations to Greengore and to The Flat and the new rooflights to The Flat would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed buildings and would not harm the character and appearance of the AONB. As those alterations are clearly severable, both appeals in respect of those works should be allowed and I shall issue split decisions in respect of both appeals.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector

Schedule of conditions

Appeal A

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and details: 15.24/10 rev A, 15.24/11 rev A, 15.24/12 Rev A (excluding from all plans the works relating to the proposed extension).
- 3) No part of the development shall take place until the surveys recommended at page 9 of the submitted Bat Building Inspection have been carried out and details of any necessary mitigation measures have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No part of the development shall take place until any necessary mitigation measures have been carried out as approved and they shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Appeal B

- 1) The works hereby authorised shall begin not later than three years from the date of this consent.
- 2) The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and details: 15.24/10 rev A, 15.24/11 rev A, 15.24/12 Rev A (excluding from all plans the works relating to the proposed extension).
- 3) No part of the development shall take place until the surveys recommended at page 9 of the submitted Bat Building Inspection have been carried out and details of any necessary mitigation measure have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No part of the development shall take place until any necessary mitigation measures have been carried out as approved and they shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details.

End of conditions.