



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2021

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E2340/W/20/3260165

Ayneslack Barn Farm, Warley Wise Lane, Colne, Lancashire BB8 7ES

- 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 M Greenwood against the decision of Pendle Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0420/FUL, dated 7 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an agricultural storage barn.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies in open countryside, near a number of other equestrian structures, an agricultural barn and two dwellings and outbuildings, some of which are in separate ownership. The site is surrounded by and visible from a number of public rights of way, and longer views are available from roads in the area. The site is relatively prominent, and the general character and appearance of the site, being a relatively tight group of buildings in an otherwise open landscape is not particularly unusual in the area. Notwithstanding that, the previously approved stable building does stand apart from the otherwise closely grouped buildings and as a result is somewhat incongruous.
4. I consider the proposal, larger than the previously approved stable building, wider than the existing agricultural barn and set some distance from the other buildings would appear unduly prominent. The proposal would result in an increasingly large spread of buildings, which would be markedly different to the characteristically tight grouping seen elsewhere on the site and wider area. This would, in my opinion, cause harm to both the established character and appearance of the site and the wider character and appearance of the open countryside.
5. I note the reference by the appellant to the Supplementary Planning Guidance: Development in the Open Countryside (the SPG), and the commentary within it on the acceptability of agricultural buildings which require planning permission. However, I do not consider that the proposal, given its size and location

relative to the other buildings in the group is consistent with the advice in the SPG or the requirement for such buildings to be adjacent to others.

6. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policy ENV1 and ENV2 of the Local Plan for Pendle: Core Strategy 2011-2030. These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development has regard to and safeguards or enhances landscape character, and that it meets the highest standards of design and form, which should inform and reflect the history and development of a place.

Other Matters

7. In the absence of any further justification for the size, location and arrangement of the proposal relative to the other buildings in the group, and the harm to character and appearance which would occur, I do not consider that there are any material considerations of such weight which indicate a decision be taken other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Dean

INSPECTOR