



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2021 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/20/3263872

Wythenstocks Barn, Back Lane, Grindleton, Clitheroe BB7 4RW

- 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 Mrs Catherine Podevyn against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2020/0617, dated 28 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'To extend an existing converted barn by way of a porch to the front elevation'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area, with particular regard to the Grindleton Conservation Area and the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a former agricultural building, converted to a residential dwelling, located within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and Grindleton Conservation Area (the GCA). The significance of the GCA appears to be partly derived from its wider rural setting and agricultural history, as identified within the Grindleton Conservation Area Appraisal. The original linear form and agricultural character of the former barn is readily discernible therefore the appeal dwelling makes a positive contribution to the GCA.
5. The proposed porch would project forward of the principle elevation, thus interrupting the linear form of the dwelling and obscuring the character and full-size of the former carriage arch. It would also significantly alter the single roofline through the introduction of a highly prominent cat slide element. The proposal would therefore erode the dwelling's former agricultural character and simple, uncluttered front elevation and linear form.

6. The proposal has been designed to reflect a cart hole, which the appellant suggests is a traditional characteristic of the local vernacular. Examples of barns with cart holes have been provided in support of this appeal however, from the limited information before me it is not clear whether they are later extensions or part of the original design in each case. Nevertheless, this feature is evidently not an original characteristic of the appeal building and, furthermore, unlike the appeal proposal, the example cart holes are open to the front with the entrance/elevation set back considerably within them. Therefore, the examples are not directly comparable and thus do not serve to justify the appeal proposal.
7. The proposed porch seeks to improve the living accommodation in the appeal dwelling, however there is no compelling evidence before me to indicate that the existing arrangement is substandard. As such, this limits the weight I can attach to this matter.
8. The statutory purpose of AONBs is to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area. Due to the limited scale of the proposal and as the appeal site is within the built environs of the village, the harm arising from the proposed development would be localised. The proposal would not therefore erode the rural character of this location and thus the natural beauty of the AONB would be conserved. Similarly, the immediate street scene varies in character due to the diverse style of buildings, many of which have front porches. Therefore, due to its scale and the site's wider context, this proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the GCA. However, these are neutral considerations which do not weigh in favour of the appeal proposal.
9. Consequently, taking all the above into consideration, whilst I do not find harm to the character and appearance of the wider area and thus no conflict with Key Statement EN2 or EN5 or Policy DME4 of the Core Strategy 2008-2028 A Local Plan for Ribble Valley (the CS) in this regard, the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. It would therefore fail to accord with Policy DMG1 of the CS which seeks to ensure that developments are of a high standard of building design.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

H Ellison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR