



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 22 June 2021

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MIEEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E2340/D/21/3269908

**Lower Broach Farmhouse, Skipton New Road, Foulridge, Lancashire
BB8 7NN**

- 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 Mrs Sneh Barker against the decision of Pendle Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0491/HHO, dated 28 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal property is in the Green Belt. Paragraph 143 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 145 sets out that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt subject to specific exceptions including Paragraph 145 c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
3. The Council has adopted a threshold value of a 25% increase in the volume of the original dwelling, above which an extension would be a disproportionate addition. In this case, the proposal would be an approximately 23% increase in the volume of the original building. On this basis, the proposal would not be a disproportionate addition to the dwelling and it would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Consequently, there is no requirement for me to consider impacts on the Green Belt further.

Main Issue

4. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. Lower Broach Farmhouse is a 2 storey semi-detached property, attached to a larger residential property. It is in the open countryside to the east of the settlement of Foulridge, accessed from the A56 Skipton New Road via an unadopted rough surfaced single width track. The appeal property is a relatively modest stone-built farmhouse with a stone roof. The front elevation

- has matching windows in stone surrounds at ground and first floor levels and it has a small pitch roof porch structure where it meets the adjoining property.
6. The proposal would be a substantially large single storey extension to the front elevation. The bulk of the extension would project forward by more than 6m. It would extend across the front elevation from the porch to the outer edge of the building. It would have a dual pitch roof finishing just below the height of the first floor windows. The front elevation of the pitched roof extension, together with the return sections on either side elevation, would be substantially glazed. There would be a flat roof glazed section linking the bulk of the extension to the porch. There would be a long window in the east elevation and roof lights.
 7. The proposal would obscure the entire ground floor front elevation. Irrespective of the matching materials, the extensive contemporary glazing and heavy frames would not be in keeping with the smaller traditional fenestration at first floor level. When viewed from the front, the proposal would dominate and it would overwhelm the principal elevation of the property. Consequently, the proposal would not relate well and it would not be sympathetic to the rural character and appearance of the host property.
 8. While the property is widely separated from residential properties closer to the A56 and nearby Foulridge, it is readily visible from the network of public rights of way to the front and the side of the property. By virtue of the prominent elevated location, and its overly large size and contemporary design, the proposal would be visually obtrusive and discordant. It would be conspicuous from further afield during low light and overnight due to the extent and pattern of light spill from elevations and the roof. The proposal would have an urbanising effect that would detract from both the character of the traditional farmhouse and the surrounding countryside. It would not make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness or sense of place.
 9. Therefore, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area. It would conflict with Policy ENV2 of Pendle Borough Council Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy Adopted December 2015. This requires, among other things, that proposals should contribute to local identity and landscape and townscape character. It would conflict with the aims of the Design Principles Supplementary Planning Document Adopted December 2009 in relation to appreciating the scale and form of the building and window styles and positions that reflect those of the original property. It would conflict with the policies in the Framework that require development to be sympathetic to local built and landscape character, to maintain a strong sense of place and to improve the character and quality of the area taking into account local design standards in plans and supplementary planning documents.

Other Matters

10. The ground floor kitchen and living room are served by windows in the front elevation only. This is not an uncommon arrangement. The windows appear to be a reasonable size, they are not obstructed and they face in a south to south-westerly direction so they will receive daylight and sunlight for a good part of the day. On this basis, while the proposal might result in an increase in natural light, there is little before me to demonstrate that the habitable ground floor rooms are currently unacceptably dark.

11. The appellant's desire to create additional living space is understandable and the extensive glazing wrapping around the front of the extension would allow greater views over the landscape from within the property. In this regard, the proposal would undoubtedly be a benefit to the appellant. However, there is little before me to demonstrate that the property does not provide a reasonable standard of living accommodation or that similar benefits could not be achieved by alternative proposals that would avoid the harm that I have found. Neither the smaller size of the appeal property compared to the adjoining property nor the absence of harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers weighs in favour of the proposal.
12. I understand the appellant's frustration in relation to the delay in processing of the planning application, although this was due to the Covid-19 pandemic disruption to normal working practices and staffing shortages. The subsequent refusal of permission will have been a disappointment, but perhaps not entirely unexpected, given that the Council had communicated its specific concerns in relation to the size of the proposal and the extent of glazing during the time the application was being considered. The appellant chose not to amend the scheme, as was her right. However, the Council was entitled to conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and to refuse permission accordingly.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict.
14. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR