



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2020

by Robert Hitchcock BSc DipCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/20/3250603

Fairclough Barn, Loud Bridge Road, Chipping PR3 2NX

- 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 Gavin Baker against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2020/0037, dated 7 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension following removal of existing conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension following removal of existing conservatory subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan stamped 320200037P by the Council and plan LF/GB/3410.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. At the time of my site visit a previous extension to the gable end of the barn shown on the submitted plans had been removed. Some works had taken place in the construction of a replacement extension. A number of deviations were apparent between the constructed development and the submitted plans. For the avoidance of doubt, this appeal is determined on the basis of the plans as submitted with the planning application, as referred to above.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the building and its locality.

Reasons

4. The building is a traditional stone and slate barn converted to a residential dwelling. It is located within an isolated cluster of mixed development in an undulating open rural landscape. The barn retains much of its original character and features but has had several alterations to facilitate the current residential

- use. These include new or altered openings, modern rooflights and new treatments to the openings.
5. The Council have identified the building as a non-designated heritage asset. Paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires that the effect of the proposed development on the significance of the building should be considered. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement is required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss, and the significance of the heritage asset.
 6. The proposed two-storey extension would maintain a simple form that would reflect that of the historic barn. The scale of the extension would represent a modest proportion of the volume and footprint of the existing building such that it would not appear disproportionate to or dominate it.
 7. The overall massing would inevitably increase but this would compare favourably to other built development within the existing cluster. I observed that the elongation of the building and degree of extension are comparable to other examples of extended traditional barns and linear buildings visible in the area. The proposal would thus retain a characteristic form and scale that would not appear incongruous in the locality.
 8. The siting of the extension would mask several of the existing openings in the southern gable, including a small nest opening close to the apex. Aside from the nest aperture, it is unclear from the evidence before me if the remainder were original openings or not. However, the main parties have drawn my attention to a recent planning permission, ref. 3/2020/0037, for an alternative single storey extension in the same location. That proposal would equally mask a substantial part of the gable and the existing openings within it, apart from the nest aperture, which is proposed to be replicated within the new gable. Accordingly, I conclude that the direct effect of the extension to the existing building would be limited.
 9. The current proposal includes a small number of new openings to the front and rear elevations. These reflect the scale, proportions and arrangement of other openings on the converted building such that they would suitably integrate with it.
 10. Conversely, the new southern gable would incorporate two large openings at ground and first floor levels. The edge treatment of the openings would be faithful to those of the existing building but they would have neither the typical traditional arrangement or proportions of the existing openings visible on the barn. Whilst these would not change the overall form of development, they would lack consistency with the architectural detailing of the original building.
 11. However, I am mindful that the extant planning permission would introduce a similar opening and modern glazing system to the ground floor, and a row of modern rooflights within a new roof slope above it. Moreover, any additional effect arising from the upper floor opening would be mitigated to a large extent by the fact that it would be orientated away from the road. The arrangement of local development, public roads, land profile and boundary treatments would significantly restrict public views of the southern openings to those over a considerable distance from the south.

12. Accordingly, whilst some limited harm would arise from the proportioning of the new openings on the southern elevation, these would not be readily visible. Furthermore, they would be incorporated on a part of the resultant building that would read as a later addition on account of the stepped elevation and corresponding lower ridge height. When balanced against the fact that the proposal would replace a previous extension which had little reference to the form, design or historic significance of the barn, I find that the overall effect on the character and appearance of the building and the locality would be neutral.
13. For those reasons, I conclude that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the building and its locality. It would therefore align with Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy 2008-2028 (2014), which, amongst other matters, seek to secure high standards of design and protect or enhance heritage assets.

Conditions

14. I have considered the suggested conditions from the Council and had regard to Paragraph 55 of the Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance in terms of the use of planning conditions. In addition to the standard condition limiting the lifespan of the planning permission, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching external surfaces is necessary and reasonable in the interest of the character and appearance of the building.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons, the appeal should be allowed.

R Hitchcock

INSPECTOR