



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2021

by **Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

now appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/W/20/3265972

Lower Seed Green Farm, Stoneygate Lane, Ribchester PR3 2ZS

- 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 P Coates against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2020/0281, dated 24 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as "the demolition of the existing two storey farmhouse and six outbuildings and the erection of a single storey replacement dwelling."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The surrounding area is characterised predominantly by groups of buildings scattered across open countryside. The built development in the area is mainly made up of residential and agricultural buildings of traditional architectural styles. It is this dispersed form of traditional designed buildings within the open countryside which positively contributes to the character of the area.
4. The proposed development would not be of traditional design and would be an unsympathetic feature within the surrounding area. The proposal being of single storey design and utilitarian in form would differ significantly from the styles of residential properties in the surrounding locality. The proposal would also not appear as an agricultural style building due to the proposed materials including large amount of glazing, unusual mix of timber and stone cladding, as well as the amount of window and door openings proposed.
5. There is some landscape screening along the boundaries with the main road. However, this landscaping would not completely screen the proposal, particularly from wider views. The proposed development, due to its siting and design, would be a prominent feature that would not blend in well with the surrounding landscape and have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area.

6. The proposal would replace an existing farmhouse and a number of agricultural buildings that are in a poor state of repair which have been described as being detrimental to the visual appearance of the area. From my site visit, I note the derelict status of some of these buildings, nevertheless, due to the styles of these buildings they still integrate well into the surrounding landscape and do not appear as incongruous features.
7. The proposed development would mainly be contained within the existing residential curtilage and the presence of domestic paraphernalia, as seen in other gardens in the area, would not be uncommon features in the locality. I have also had regard to the appellants comments on removing permitted development rights for curtilage buildings. I note that the volume of the proposal would be less than the volume of the existing buildings on the site. The appeal site is not located within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The appellant has also confirmed that appropriate visibility splays can be provided and the development would be in accordance with the submitted Bat, Barn Owl and Nesting Bird Survey Report. These matters however, would not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
8. I have had regard to the appellants statement of case and planning statement including reference to similar developments¹ in Ribble Valley. Whilst taking into consideration the Planning Practice Guidance, including paragraph 049, insufficient information has been submitted with regards to these other developments and I cannot be sure that these schemes are directly comparable to the appeal scheme, particularly with reference to location and design.
9. Accordingly, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal fails to comply with Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DMH3 of the Local Plan for Ribble Valley 2014 which seeks development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflect local distinctiveness, features and buildings materials.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR

¹ Developments including: Sawley Lodge; The Eaves; Moorhouse Farm; Painley Farm; Lower Read Wood Farm.