



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2022

**by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 9<sup>TH</sup> June 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/D/22/3293088**

**Hambleton Hall Barn, Mill Lane, Hambleton, Lancashire, FY6 9DE**

- 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 Duckworth against the decision of Wyre Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 21/01253/FUL, dated 13 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2021.
  - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension at Hambleton Hall Barn, Mill Lane, Hambleton, Lancashire, FY6 9DE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01253/FUL, dated 13 October 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: Ref 1921.01 – Location Plan, Ref 1921.03 revision P1 – Ground floor Plan & Elevation as proposed.
  - 3) The material to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

## Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal is a resubmission of a planning application (ref 21/00581/FUL) for a single storey extension that was refused on grounds relating to harm to the architectural integrity and character of the traditional barn conversion, with particular reference to its design, appearance and materials. The scheme has been amended to replace cedar weather boarding with brick and stone, the rooflights have been reduced in height and the extent of glazing in the rear elevation has been reduced.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

4. Hambleton Hall Barn is part of a cluster of dwellings created from the conversion of barns formerly associated with the nearby Hambleton Hall Grade

II listed farmhouse. The appeal property sits to the rear of the building group in an area of sparsely developed open countryside.

5. The appeal property is a historic farm building, although it is not listed as a heritage asset and it has been comprehensively domesticated including by the creation of a large number of new residential window and door openings. The retained cart door opening in the principal elevation overlooking the former yard provides a visual link to its historic agricultural usage. However, overall, it has a residential appearance with very limited archaeological significance remaining in relation to its historic association with Hambleton Hall.
6. The proposed extension would occupy a recess in the rear elevation of the dwelling between 2 single storey brick extensions with catslide slate roofs. It would have a flat roof with 2 rooflights and it would finish below the first floor windows in the main 2 storey rear elevation. The rear elevation of the proposal, which would be set back from the single storey rear elevations to either side, would have extensive glazed bi-fold aluminium doors with walls finished in course stone between bands of rustic facing brickwork.
7. By virtue of its siting and scale, the extension would only be visible in views of the rear of the property. However, there are no dwellings or public access in close proximity to the rear such as would allow overlooking. The rear garden is in any case enclosed and screened by tall boundary treatments including walls, fences and dense shrubs and trees. While vegetation is temporary and it should not be relied upon to screen development, I have no reason to think that the mature garden planting would not be retained. Even if the vegetation was removed, or it provided a less effective screen in winter, there would still be no close views of the proposal from neighbouring properties or public land.
8. The plans illustrate that the roof line and fascia board would be slightly higher than the single storey eaves to either side. However, it would be set back and it would not protrude above the flanking roof slopes. Moreover, the rear of the roof would sit comfortably between the ground and first floor windows in the main 2 storey rear elevation. Taking into account the visual context of the adjoining roof slope, with its large recess at first floor height and roof lights, the flat roof design would not be a visually obtrusive or discordant feature.
9. Furthermore, the flat roof would allow the historic first floor rear elevation to remain visible above the proposal. The bifold doors would allow views, albeit somewhat obscured, of the cobble stone ground floor elevation. Consequently, the proposal would enable an appreciation of the historic fabric and layout of the building. While the bifold doors would be a contemporary feature, there are already fully glazed double doors in the rear elevation and modern bi-fold doors serve the kitchen. Therefore, the doors would not be out of keeping taking into account the existing modern fenestration and doors.
10. The proposal would be finished in materials to match and it would be subservient in scale to its host. While the strong brick banding illustrated on the plans may not be a feature of the appeal property, nevertheless the recessed 2 storey elevation appears to have weak brick banding in places. In contrast to the historic stone fabric, the rustic brickwork and the residential window and door openings in the ground floor and the single storey extensions result in a relatively generic and somewhat modern domestic appearance. As the original barn and its later extensions already differ from one another and they have been altered, the proposal, while different again, would not disrupt a

coherent or authentic historic building. Consequently, I find that by virtue of its large scale and previous alterations, the appeal property could accommodate the proposal without detriment to visual amenity.

11. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the appeal property nor would it erode architectural or historic integrity. It would not conflict with Policy CDMP3 of Wyre Council Local Plan (2011-2031) Adopted February 2019, including in relation to respecting the character of the area and making a positive contribution to an attractive and coherent townscape. It would accord with the aims of the Council's Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document Design Note 1 which, among other things, requires that extensions appear subordinate and that they are sympathetic to the design and architecture of the original property. There would also be no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework including in relation to development being visually attractive and sympathetic to the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

### **Other Matters**

12. The appeal property was formerly associated with Hambleton Hall Grade II listed farmhouse. Section 66(1) of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting. In this case, the extension would not protrude beyond the rear elevation of the appeal property. Moreover, it would be widely separated and well screened from the listed building and its grounds. The Council considers that the proposal would have a neutral impact on the setting of the listed building and I see no reason to disagree.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted, subject to conditions.

*Sarah Manchester*

INSPECTOR