



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2023

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/22/3307170

The Barn By The River, Kenyon Lane, Dinckley BB6 8AN

- 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 Ms A Holt against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2022/0044, dated 10 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as “replacement two storey outbuilding”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed outbuilding on the setting of the Grade II* Listed Dinckley Hall and on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a residential barn conversion and associated outbuilding together with surrounding garden area. The site is set centrally within a small group of buildings including Dinckley Hall, a Grade II* Listed Building and Ellis House, another residential barn conversion. The group of buildings is located very close to the River Ribble in an isolated rural setting.
4. Dinckley Hall is a two-storey building dating back to c1600 with later additions and alterations, comprising stone rubble and rendered walls together with prominent chimneys. It appears from the evidence that the Hall was historically a farmhouse with a practical relationship with the surrounding agricultural land. Its close physical relationship with the host property and the adjacent Ellis House is reminiscent of its former use as a farmhouse and their use as barns associated with the Hall. It appears that the barns are not original but are later replacements and both have now been converted to residential use. However, notwithstanding this and the fact that there is no longer a functional relationship between the buildings, the historic connection of the barns to the Hall and the close physical relationship between the buildings within the small group means that the appeal site forms an important part of and contributes to the setting of Dinckley Hall. This contributes to its significance.
5. The proposed part two-storey, part single-storey outbuilding would replace an existing single storey outbuilding located in a similar position adjacent to the host property, between it and Ellis House. Unlike the existing outbuilding, which is finished in render, the proposed outbuilding would have stone walling under a slate roof to match the host property. It would also have a traditional

pitched roof form, though unlike the existing outbuilding, it would contain a chimney. The front part of the proposed outbuilding would be single storey, with the higher two storey element being set back from the front elevation of the host property, close to the river.

6. Whilst the main ridge height of the proposed outbuilding is below that of the host property and surrounding buildings, it would nevertheless be taller and more prominent than the existing outbuilding which appears much more subservient to the key buildings within the group including Dinckley Hall. This increase in height and prominence would disrupt the important physical relationship between the barns and the Hall. This is despite the fact that the proposed outbuilding would be set back from the frontage of the host property and Ellis House and separated from the Hall by the host property. In addition, the presence of a large, glazed gable feature in the rear elevation of the proposed outbuilding together with the chimney gives it a domesticated appearance. Despite its domestic setting and the presence of chimneys on other buildings within the group, this combined with its additional height means that rather than it appearing as an ancillary outbuilding, it would compete with the existing two storey structures in the group.
7. This relationship, despite the intervening distance and landscaping in places, would be apparent from various public vantage points including from the public footpath to the south-west of the site and to the west of the site on the opposite side of the river. Any benefits derived from a more conventional roof form and the use of more traditional, muted materials would be outweighed by the harm arising from the scale and design of the proposed outbuilding. I note that the Council has also raised concerns with regard to the choice of framing material and the design of the garage door. However, whilst I note that these are not traditional design features reflective of the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding buildings, were I minded to allow the appeal then these matters could be adequately controlled by the imposition of suitably worded conditions.
8. In reaching this conclusion, I have had regard to the Heritage Statement (HS) submitted by the appellant in support of the proposal. Notwithstanding the conclusions of the HS, for the reasons stated above, I find that the proposed outbuilding would be harmful to the Listed Building.
9. The proposal also includes an extension to an existing single storey lean-to on the host property. The extension would be modest in size and constructed in matching materials. The Council raises no objections to this aspect of the proposal and given the above, neither do I.
10. However, for the reasons stated above, the scale, position and design of the proposed outbuilding is such that it would be harmful to the setting of the Grade II* Listed Dinckley Hall and to the character and appearance of the area. The harm to the setting of the Listed Building that would result from the proposed outbuilding would be less than substantial. I have attached considerable importance and weight to the desirability of avoiding any such harmful effect on the Listed Building in accordance with Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act). Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the

significance of a heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

11. No public benefits have been put forward by the appellant in support of the proposed outbuilding and in the absence of any public benefits to outweigh the harm identified, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the setting of the Listed Building and would not meet the requirements of section 66 of the Act. Similarly, it would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Key Statements EN2 and EN5 and policies DME4, DMG1, DMG2 and DMH5 of the Core Strategy 2008 - 2028¹. These policies, amongst other matters, expect development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape reflecting local style and features, to conserve the significance of heritage assets and to be of a high standard of design. Similarly, it would be contrary to relevant paragraphs in the Framework.

Other Matters

12. My attention has been drawn to other decisions made by the Council in the vicinity of the appeal site and also to other appeal decisions. I have limited information regarding these other proposals and therefore cannot assess how similar or otherwise they might be to the proposal before me. Although I have been provided with a copy of two appeal decisions, neither appear to be directly comparable to the proposal in that they relate to single storey outbuildings considered to be subservient in nature by the decision makers, only one of which is near to a listed building. Consequently, I attach limited weight to these other examples.
13. I also note that the proposal is a revised scheme which seeks to overcome the Council's concerns in relation to a previous application (Ref 3/2021/0767). However, for the reasons stated above, I consider the revised scheme to be harmful.
14. I also note that no objections were raised to the proposal by statutory consultees and that no objections were raised by either the Parish Council or by local residents. However, this does not weigh in favour of the proposal or alter the outcome of the appeal.

Conclusion

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

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR

¹ Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy 2008 – 2028 A Local Plan for Ribble Valley Adoption Version.