



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2022

by E Worthington BA (Hons) MTP MUED MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/21/3289593
Brockthorn, Tosside, Skipton, BD23 4SX

- 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 Martyn Schofield against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2021/0745, dated 6 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is a new boot room to north elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new boot room to north elevation at Brockthorn, Tosside, Skipton, BD23 4SX in accordance with the terms of application Ref: 3/2021/0745, dated 6 July 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing number 3987-03A proposed site plan, and drawing number 3987-02A proposed plans and elevations.
 - 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.

Procedural Matter

2. Whilst the name given on the application is Mr Martyn, the name given on the decision notice and the appeal form is Mr Martyn Schofield. Since the name used on the application form with the surname omitted is likely to have been provided in error, in the interests of accuracy I have used the appellant's full name as given on the decision notice and appeal form in the heading above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property.
-

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a recently converted stone barn in a cluster of development off Wigglesworth Road. The surrounding area is rural and the site is within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
5. When it was converted to residential use the Council considered the appeal building to be worthy of retention due to its contribution to the character of the area and its interest as a traditional agricultural building. I understand that efforts were made at that time to restrict domestic additions and alterations and that householder permitted development rights were removed. Despite its conversion to a dwelling the appeal building retains its simple linear form and generally agricultural character.
6. The proposed single storey porch extension would be to the building's north elevation. It would be modest in size, with a lean-to roof and simple functional design with a single door to its north elevation and a small window to each flank elevation. It would be constructed in stone and slate to match the host building and would appear subservient to it.
7. The appeal building is positioned on a bend in Wigglesworth Road. Although its south elevation directly faces the road, its north elevation is set roughly at right angles to the road and faces out onto its own parking/garden area and the open countryside beyond. As such, the proposed porch would not be on the building's main or principal elevation. It would also relate closely to the residential curtilage that has been created to what is effectively the rear of the building.
8. The land surrounding the appeal building rises to the north, west and east such that it sits in a dip. This topography, along with the site's substantial roadside stone wall, for the most part screens public views of the ground floor of the building's north elevation. As a result, although some very limited close range views of the proposed extension would be possible from Wigglesworth Road over the wall, it would not be immediately visible or obvious in longer range views on approach from the north. Nor has it been put to me that the proposal would be appreciated from any other vantage points such as nearby footpaths or rights of way. Thus, I am content that the proposal would not be highly visible or prominent in public views.
9. Taking all these factors into account, I am content that due to its siting, limited scale and simple traditional form as described, the proposal would sit comfortably on the appeal property. Whilst it would alter the building's simple linear form and add to the complexity of the appearance of its north elevation, I am not persuaded that it would appear overtly domestic or alien there. Thus I find that it would not undermine the traditional rural character of the host building or erode its legibility as a former barn to any harmful extent. In coming to this view I have had regard to the Historic England advice regarding adapting traditional farm buildings as referred to by the Council.
10. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property. Thus it would not be contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (Core Strategy) which requires all development to be of a high standard of building design (1)

and be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing, style features and building materials (2). It would also align with Core Strategy Policy DMH5 which states that proposals to extend or alter existing residential properties must accord with Policy DMG1 and any relevant designations in which the site is located.

11. Furthermore, I see no conflict with Core Strategy Policy DNH4 which concerns the conversion of barns and other buildings to dwellings and refers only to the grant of planning permission for the conversion of buildings (and not to their subsequent alteration as is the case in this appeal).

Other matters

12. Whilst not part of the reason for refusal, I am mindful that the site is within the AONB. The officer's report refers to the barn's positive contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and to Policy EN2 which requires development to be in-keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, features and building materials. However, since I have found that the proposal would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the host property, I am also content that it would cause no harm to its surroundings and would thereby conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB in line with Policy EN2 and paragraph 176 of the Framework.

Conclusion and Conditions

13. For the above reasons, and taking all other matters raised into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.
14. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which I have considered in light of the advice in the Framework which establishes that conditions should only be imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development (or works) to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.
15. I have imposed the standard time limit condition in the interests of clarity. A condition is required to specify the approved plans in the interests of certainty. A further condition is needed to ensure that the materials used in the construction of the extension match those of the existing building in the interests of character and appearance.

E Worthington

INSPECTOR