



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 January 2021

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/W/20/3258767

Three Millstones Inn, Waddington Road, West Bradford, BB7 4SX

- 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 Matthew Frost against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2020/0329, dated 23 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey building at the rear of the public house to create an additional guest bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, timber fencing had been installed along the sides of the walkway at the rear of the existing building. The submitted drawings also indicate some timber fencing alongside the proposed building. However, the fencing which I observed on site did not appear consistent with the fencing indicated on the submitted drawings, including with regard to its height or extent. For the avoidance of doubt, I have considered the appeal, including any fencing, on the basis of the proposal as shown on the submitted drawings.
3. The site has been subject to a previous dismissed appeal decision¹ to erect a similar building at the rear of the public house. I attach significant weight to the previous Inspector's findings, albeit I note that the current proposal has a different design to the previous scheme.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the setting of the Grade II listed Three Millstones Inn.

Reasons

5. The appeal site consists of a raised area to the rear of the Three Millstones Inn, which is a Grade II listed building constructed mainly in whitewashed rubble stone. From Waddington Road, the building has a relatively formal appearance, with regularly aligned windows and doors set within stone surrounds and mullions. It forms a gateway feature at the entrance to the

¹ APP/T2350/W/19/3239000

village and is a prominent local landmark. The rear of the building has a simpler appearance and has been subject to a number of extensions over the years. Whilst less prominent in views from along the road, the rear elevation is clearly visible from the pub car park and other parts of the site, and in more distant public views. The informal areas to the rear of the building also contribute to its significance and provide a link to the countryside to the south, which was historically associated with the Inn.

6. The existing side and rear extensions to the listed building are mostly single storey in height and are sympathetic in their scale, detailing, use of materials, and roof profiles. In contrast, the appeal proposal would introduce a large building at first floor level that would have an uncharacteristic asymmetric roof profile. Some of the proposed materials, such as the glazed rear double doors and timber fencing, would also visually jar with the traditional materials used in the listed building. The development would project out significantly from the rear of the building, and well beyond the existing 2 storey rear extension. Given its elevated position, the it would be prominent in views of the listed building from the pub car park and the rear of the site. From these positions it would appear as a large discordant feature, at odds with the character of the host building.
7. It is asserted that the previous Inspector has accepted various elements of the current proposal. However, having carefully read that decision, it is not clear that this is the case. In this regard, the previous Inspector raised concerns regarding the height and prominence of that proposal and in relation to the use of timber fencing and full height rear glazing.
8. It is further asserted that the appeal site comprises redundant disused land. However, the current condition of the site does not justify a development with the shortcomings I have identified above.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would harm the setting of the Grade II listed Three Millstones Inn. This harm would be 'less than substantial' in the context of Paragraphs 195-196 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'). However, the public benefits associated with the scheme, including the provision of an additional unit of accommodation, and the generation of some economic benefits, would not outweigh the harm in this case.
10. The development would therefore be contrary to guidance in the Framework relating to designated heritage assets. It would also be at odds with the relevant sections of Policies DME4 and DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (2014). These policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that new development is of a high standard of building design that does not harm the significance of heritage assets.

Conclusion

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

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR