



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2019

by Jamie Reed DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/19/3227340

Wolfen Lodge, Fish House Lane, Chipping PR3 2GR

- 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 & Mrs Ballard against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2018/1148, dated 14 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 18 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear extension at Wolfen Lodge, Fish House Lane, Chipping PR3 2GR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/2018/1148, dated 14 December 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing Plans, Existing Elevations, Roof Plan and Typical Section, 3074/001 Rev A; Proposed Floor Plans, Elevations, Roof Plan and Section, 3074/002 Rev B; Proposed Rear Elevation, Block Plan and Location Plan, 3074/003 Rev B; Existing Block Plan, 3074/004.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the Method Statement contained within the Reasonable Avoidance Measures document dated 29 November 2018 submitted with the application.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding countryside, which includes the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a large, former agricultural barn of stone construction with a natural slate roof and was converted to a 2 storey dwelling many years ago. The property is accessed via a long private driveway which leads from Footpath 110 and is set within its own extensive grounds which are enclosed by tall hedgerows. When outside of the site, very little of the appeal property is readily visible, other than a small glimpse of the front elevation, when looking down the private driveway from Footpath 110.
4. The proposal would involve the demolition of an existing conservatory to the rear of the property. This features a slate 'cat slide' roof which ties into the eaves of the original building and effectively forms a continuation of the roof slope, bringing this down to single storey level. Such an arrangement results in the conservatory relating well with the original form of the building. The proposed extension would have a similar 'cat slide' roof and projection as the conservatory and would be about twice its width. Whilst greater in width, the extension would nonetheless be of a similar form that would assimilate well with the original form of the appeal property, much in the same way as the conservatory, which it would replace. Furthermore, due to the proposed extension being located to the rear of the appeal property, which faces onto the extensive enclosed rear garden area, it would not be readily visible outwith the site.
5. The Council have stated that they consider the building to be a non-designated heritage asset as a result of its age and character and have suggested that the proposed extension would detract from the visual quality and traditional appearance of the building as a barn. Due to the well-weathered appearance of the alterations that would have been carried out a significant period of time ago however, the building now has far more of a domestic character and appearance than that of an agricultural barn. When viewed in context with the small amount of other residential buildings that are nearby, the building fits in well with the vernacular and does not appear inharmonious. In addition, the site's extensive mature gardens and landscaping unequivocally characterise the site as a whole as being domestic in nature. As a result, I give this argument only limited weight.
6. The Council also suggest that the scale and appearance of the proposals would introduce overly domestic features that would not be in-keeping with the original building or respect its existing fenestration. As explained above, the appeal building and its site are clearly of a well-established residential nature and whilst the extension would be larger in size than what may normally be seen on a residential property, the original building itself is large and can, therefore, readily accommodate such a proposal. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property or the surrounding area.
7. Consequently, the proposed extension does not conflict with Key Statement EN2 and EN5 and Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (2014). When read together, these require developments to be of a high quality design that are in keeping with the character of the surrounding landscape and vernacular whilst avoiding any substantial harm.
8. The site is located within the Forest of Bowland AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that great weight is to be afforded

to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty of such areas, which have the highest status of protection. Accordingly, I have also paid special attention as to whether the proposal would conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the AONB. Due to its setting to the rear of the appeal property, within its secluded private gardens, the proposal would not be readily visible and therefore would not harm the AONB, thereby conserving its natural beauty.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested a number of planning conditions. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty and a condition requiring that the materials used match the appeal property, in order to ensure that the development is in-keeping with the character and appearance of the appeal property. Also, in order that any potential impacts upon protected species are minimised, I have imposed a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the method statement contained within the Reasonable Avoidance Measures document dated 29 November 2018 that was submitted with the application.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed, subject to the above conditions.

Jamie Reed

INSPECTOR