



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2024

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/W/24/3336383

Kitchens Cross Lane, Bashall Eaves BB7 3NA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms S Howard against Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 3/2023/0216.
 - The development proposed is a stable block and manege for private use.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission for a proposed stable block and manege for private use is refused.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Ms S Howard against Ribble Valley Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. A copy of an appeal decision relating to this site, reference APP/T2350/W/21/3281836, relating to the erection of a new stable block and change of use of land for all-weather manege for private use, has been provided as an appeal document. I have had regard to it in reaching my decision.
4. The appeal follows the Council's failure to determine the respective planning application. In response to the lodging of the appeal, the Council confirms that had it determined the application it would have refused it on two grounds. The appellant has had the opportunity to respond to those grounds in their final comments, and would not, therefore, be prejudiced by my taking them into account and for them forming the main issue.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Forest of Bowland National Landscape.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape (NL) which contains wooded areas and fields bounded by hedgerows. The site is to the south of Cross Lane within a field, devoid of buildings, that forms part of an extensive undeveloped area. Whilst there is some built development nearby,

including dwellings close to the site on the north side of Cross Lane, it is set sporadically along the rural road network. The open nature of the appeal site contributes to the rural landscape in a positive manner.

7. The NL is a designation of national importance and in accordance with paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing its landscape and scenic beauty. Consequently, whilst equestrian development is commonly found in countryside locations, it must not detract from the landscape it is within.
8. The proposed manege would be surfaced in rubber and bark contained by railway sleepers that would project above ground level. It would appear as a clearly unnatural feature that would cover an extensive area. Accordingly, it would not respect the form or appearance of the undeveloped field where it would be sited or the wider rural landscape of the NL.
9. The appearance of the proposed timber clad, single storey stable block, with low pitched roof, would be typical of stable buildings. It would have a smaller floor area than the stable block of the previous appeal proposal. Nonetheless, it would still be apparent in public views from the nearby road network.
10. The surfaced access track, timber fence, parking and manoeuvring space would constitute a further encroachment into the countryside. Furthermore, the loss of hedgerow, necessary to achieve a safe access, would exacerbate the visual impact of the proposed development.
11. Accordingly, the development, as a whole, would be of a significant scale in an otherwise open area of countryside. While views would be filtered through boundary hedges and wooded areas, the visual discordance of the proposal would be obvious within the open undeveloped context of the surrounding fields and areas of woodland to the south of Cross Lane.
12. For the above reasons, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Forest of Bowland NL. There would be conflict with Policies DMG1 DMG2, and Key Statement EN2 of the Core Strategy. Together these policies seek a high standard of design, to protect the character of the NL, and expects development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness and scale. I also find that the proposal would not comply with the principles of the Framework, which I have described above.

Conclusion

13. The development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
14. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed, and planning permission refused.

Elaine Moulton

INSPECTOR