



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2021

by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/W/21/3274371

Pinfold Farm, Preston Road, Ribchester, PR3 3YD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
- The appeal is made by Mr A Davies against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
- The application Ref 3/2021/0096, dated 26 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 February 2021.
- The development proposed is the change of use from agricultural building to one dwelling and associated operational development.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is granted under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q(a) and (b), of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for the change of use from agricultural building to one dwelling and associated operational development at Pinfold Farm, Preston Road, Ribchester, PR3 3YD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/2021/0096, dated 26 January 2021, and the details submitted with it, subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) Prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted details of the boundary treatment of the residential curtilage shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the LPA. The boundary treatment shall be erected or planted prior to occupation and retained thereafter.
 - 2) Prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted the two adjacent agricultural buildings shall be removed as shown on the Proposed Site Plan Reference 002.

Background and Main Issue

2. The appeal relates to an application for the change of use of an agricultural building and associated operations under Paragraphs Q (a) and Q (b) of the *Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)* (GPDO).
3. There is no dispute between the parties with regard to the compliance of the scheme with all the criteria in paragraph Q.1 and with paragraph Q.2 (a) to (e) and (g). Based on the evidence before me and the observations I made at my site visit, I have no reason to take a different view in terms of the scheme's compliance with these particular paragraphs. Therefore, the focus of my

determination of the appeal has been the area of difference between the parties which relates to paragraph Q.2 (f).

4. In the light of this the main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the design and external appearance of the building.

Reasons

5. The agricultural building that is the subject of the appeal is a relatively modern fully enclosed portal frame structure. The base of the walls are constructed from concrete blocks with the top part being clad with Yorkshire boarding. The roof consists of corrugated cement roof sheets. The front elevation has a large sliding door, but otherwise there are no other openings on the barn.
6. The proposal would convert the barn to a dwelling whose external walls would be clad in timber and whose roof would be constructed from powder coated metal sheeting. Both these would reflect materials commonly found on modern agricultural buildings and which I observed on other barns in the locality. As such, the use of these materials would be sympathetic to the agricultural character of the building.
7. It is proposed to replace the existing door on the front elevation with full height glazing which would incorporate a door into the property. Whilst a greater height than the existing sliding door, the scale and proportions of this would reflect the large agricultural opening.
8. A similar sized opening is proposed on the rear elevation. Although this would not replace an existing opening it is not unusual for barns to have large openings at either end and so it would not appear out of character.
9. Other than this, both the number of openings added to the building and the size of them, have been kept to the minimum necessary to ensure light is provided to habitable rooms. The irregular shape and size of the windows and the high solid to void ratio they would maintain would ensure that the building retains its agricultural character. Moreover, the use of louvred timber cladding would reduce the visibility of the windows, and would match the timber cladding on the walls.
10. The existing barn has a number of clear panels in the roof allowing light in. Given this the proposed rooflights, which are small in size, would not be out of character.
11. As such, I am satisfied that the proposal would not unacceptably harm the design or the external appearance of the building. Accordingly, I consider it would not conflict with the requirements of paragraph Q.2(f) of the GPDO.

Conditions

12. The GPDO attaches various standard conditions to this type of development, including that development must be completed within a period of 3 years (paragraph Q.2.(3)), and be in accordance with the approved details (paragraph W(12)(a)).
13. The GPDO also indicates that conditions reasonably related to the subject matter of the prior approval can be imposed (paragraph W(13)). I have assessed the Council's suggested condition on this basis and the tests for conditions set out in the Framework.

14. In order to protect character and appearance of the area a condition to ensure adequate boundary treatment is provided around the curtilage of the dwellings is necessary. To ensure adequate light is provided to rooms on the eastern elevation, a condition is necessary to ensure the adjacent agricultural buildings are removed as shown on the drawings accompanying the application. As matters of design and external appearance, and the provision of adequate natural light are both assessment issues, I consider these conditions are reasonably related to the prior approval.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed and prior approval should be granted.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR