



LISTED BUILDING CONSENT APPEAL FORM

If you need this document in large print, in audio format or in Braille, please contact our helpline on 0303 444 5000. To help you fill in this form correctly please refer to the enclosed guidance leaflet "How to complete your listed building appeal form".

WARNING: The appeal and essential supporting documents must reach the Inspectorate within the appeal period. If your appeal and essential supporting documents are not received in time we will not accept the appeal.

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY IN CAPITALS USING **BLACK** INK

A. APPELLANT DETAILS

See section A of the guidance leaflet. The name of the person(s) making the appeal must appear as an applicant on the planning application form.

Name **M R L E N M O R R I S**

Company/Group name (if applicable)

Address **W O L F E N H A L L C H I P P I N G P R E S T O N**

Postcode **P R 3 2 N Z**

Daytime phone

Fax

I prefer to be contacted by Post Email*

*Email address

B. AGENT DETAILS (IF ANY) FOR THE APPEAL

See section B of the guidance leaflet.

Name **A L A N D C R O S T O N**

Company/Group name (if applicable)

Address **A R L E Y H O U S E P R E S T O N N E W R O A D**
M E L L O R B L A C K B U R N

Postcode **B B Z 7 N P**

Your reference

Daytime phone **0 7 9 8 5 5 8 6 5 4 3** Fax

I prefer to be contacted by Post Email*

*Email address **a l a n c r o s t o n @ t i s c a l i . c o . u k**

C. LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY (LPA) DETAILS

See section C of the guidance leaflet.

Name of the LPA **R I B B L E V A L L E Y B O R O U G H**

LPA's application reference number **3 / 2 0 1 5 / 0 5 1 8**

Date of the LPA application **0 8 0 6 2 0 1 5**

Date of the LPA's decision notice if issued **1 0 0 9 2 0 1 5**

D. APPEAL SITE ADDRESS

See section D of the guidance leaflet.

Address

WOLFEN HALL FISH HOUSE LANE
CHIPPING LANCASTHIRE
Postcode PR3 2NZ

Note: Failure to provide the full postcode may delay the processing of your appeal

Please answer the question below:

- 1 Is the appeal site within a Green Belt? Yes No
- 2 Are there any health and safety issues at, or near, the site which the Inspector would need to take into account when visiting the site? If so, please describe them on a separate sheet. Yes No

E. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

See section E of the guidance leaflet.

1 Please indicate the grade of the listed building

Grade I Grade II* Grade II

2 Has a grant been made under sections 3A or 4 of the Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953?

Yes No

F. DESCRIPTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT

See section F of the guidance leaflet.

Has the description of the development changed from that on the application form? Yes No

SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO REAR AND
EXTENSION OF CURTILAGE TO CREATE A WALLED
BACK GARDEN

Area of the whole appeal site (i.e. the boundary) in hectares 358.00

Area of floor space of proposed development in square metres 30

G. REASON FOR THE APPEAL

See section G of the guidance leaflet.

The reason for this appeal is that the LPA has (please tick which applies):

- 1 Refused listed building consent for the development described in Section F. 1
- 2 Granted listed building consent for the development subject to conditions to which you object. 2
- 3 Refused to vary a condition(s) in a previous grant of listed building consent. 3
- 4 Refused to remove a condition(s) in a previous grant of listed building consent. 4
- or
- 5 Failed to give notice of its decision within the appropriate period (usually 8 weeks) on an application for listed building consent. 5

H. CHOICE OF PROCEDURE

It is important that you read carefully section H of the guidance leaflet before you complete this section.

There are 3 possible procedures:- written representations, hearings and inquiries. You should consider carefully which method suits your circumstances before selecting your preferred option by ticking the box.

1 THE WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS PROCEDURE

W *

This is normally the simplest, quickest and most straightforward way of making an appeal. The written procedure is suited to the vast majority of appeals. You should refer to the criteria within the guidance leaflet to help you select the appropriate option.

- * a) Could the Inspector see the relevant parts of the appeal site sufficiently to judge the proposal from public land? Yes No
- b) Is it essential for the Inspector to enter the site to check measurements or other relevant facts? If so, please explain below or on a separate sheet. Yes No

IN ORDER TO SEE THE SITING

2 THE HEARING PROCEDURE

H ◆

This procedure is likely to be suited to more complicated cases which require detailed discussion about the merits of a proposal. Although you may indicate a preference for a hearing, the Inspectorate must also consider that your appeal is suitable for this procedure. If you are proposing that this appeal follows the hearing procedure you must submit a draft statement of common-ground. You must give detailed reasons below or on a separate sheet why you think a hearing is necessary.

- ◆ a) If you are proposing that this appeal follows the hearing procedure you must liaise with the LPA and agree two alternative dates on which a hearing could take place. The dates should not fall on a Monday but should be between the period 7 - 11 weeks from submission of your appeal.

Please note that failure to provide at least one agreed date will result in a date being fixed by the Planning Inspectorate.

- b) Is there any further information relevant to the hearing which you need to tell us about? If yes please explain below. Yes No

3 THE INQUIRY PROCEDURE

I ▲

This is the most formal of the procedures. Although you may indicate a preference for an inquiry the Inspectorate must also consider that your appeal is suitable for this procedure. You are required to provide information concerning the number of witnesses and the length of time they need to give their evidence. If you are proposing that this appeal follows the inquiry procedure you must submit a draft statement of common ground. You must give detailed reasons below or on a separate sheet why you think an inquiry is necessary.

- ▲ a) How many witnesses do you intend to call? No. of witnesses
- b) How long do they need to give their evidence?
- c) How long do you estimate the inquiry will last? No. of days
(Note: We will take this into consideration, but please bear in mind that our estimate will also be informed by others' advice and our own assessment.)
- d) If you are proposing that this appeal follows the inquiry procedure and have estimated that it will last no more than 2 days you must liaise with the LPA and agree two alternative dates on which an inquiry could open and enter the details below. The opening date should not fall on a Monday or Friday but should be between the period 10 - 17 weeks from submission of your appeal.

Please note that failure to provide at least one agreed date will result in a date being fixed by the Planning Inspectorate

- e) Is there any further information relevant to the inquiry which you need to tell us about? If so, please explain below. Yes No

I. FULL STATEMENT OF CASE

See section I of the guidance leaflet to help you decide what to include in your full statement of case.

Under revised appeal procedures introduced in October 2013 there is no further opportunity to add to your statement of case at a later stage.

Do you intend to submit a planning obligation (a section 106 agreement or a unilateral undertaking) with this appeal?

Yes No

Have you made a costs application with this appeal?

Yes No

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED STATEMENT DOCUMENT

I. FULL STATEMENT OF CASE (continued)

[This area contains a large grid of faint, illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary

J. SITE OWNERSHIP CERTIFICATES

This must be completed for all appeals
See section I of the guidance leaflet.

We need to know who owns the appeal site. If you do not own the appeal site or if you own only a part of it, we need to know the name(s) of the owner(s) or part owner(s) and be sure that you have told them that you have made an appeal.

You must tick below which of the "certificates" applies.

'Please tick **ONE** box only' ✓

If you are the **sole** owner of the **whole** appeal site, certificate A will apply:

CERTIFICATE A

A

I certify that, on the day 21 days before the date of this appeal, nobody except the appellant, was the owner of any part of the building to which the appeal relates:

OR

CERTIFICATE B

B

I certify that the appellant (or the agent) has given the requisite notice to everyone else who, on the day 21 days before the date of this appeal, was the owner of any part of the building to which the appeal relates, as listed below:

Owner's name

Address at which the notice was served

Date the notice was served (this must be within the last 21 days)

Owner's name	Address at which the notice was served	Date the notice was served (this must be within the last 21 days)

OR

CERTIFICATES C & D

C/D

If you do not know who owns all or part of the appeal site, complete either Certificate C or Certificate D in the guidance leaflet and attach it to the appeal form.

K. ESSENTIAL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS If we do not receive ALL your appeal documents by the end of the 6 month appeal period we will not accept your appeal. See section K of the guidance leaflet.

You **must** send the documents listed 1-6 below with your appeal form. Please tick the boxes to show which documents you are enclosing.

- 1 A copy of the **listed building consent application** sent to the LPA. 1
- 2 A copy of the **site ownership certificate and ownership details** submitted to the LPA at application stage (this is usually part of the LPA's planning application form). 2
- 3 A copy of the **LPA's decision notice** (if issued). Or, in the event of the failure of the LPA to give a decision, if possible please enclose a copy of the LPA's letter in which they acknowledged the application. 3
- 4 A **site plan** (preferably on a copy of an Ordnance Survey map at not less than 10,000 scale) showing the general location of the proposed development and its boundary. This plan should show two named roads so as to assist identifying the location of the appeal site or premises. The application site should be edged or shaded in red and any other adjoining land owned or controlled by the appellant (if any) edged or shaded blue. 4
- 5 Copies of all **plans, drawings and documents** sent to the LPA as part of the application. The plans and drawings should show all boundaries and coloured markings given on those sent to the LPA. 5

Please number them clearly and list the numbers here or on a separate sheet.

SEE SEPARATE SHEET

- 6 Copies of any **additional** plans, drawings and documents sent to the LPA but which did not form part of the original application (e.g. drawings for illustrative purposes). 6
- Please number them clearly and list the numbers here or on a separate sheet.

You must send copies of the following, if appropriate:

- 7 A copy of the **design and access statement** sent to the LPA. 7
- 8 A copy of a draft statement of common ground if you have indicated the appeal should follow the hearing or inquiry procedure 8
- 9 Additional plans, drawings or documents relating to the application **but not previously seen by the LPA.** 9

Please number them clearly and list the numbers here or on a separate sheet:

- 10 If the appeal is against the LPA's refusal or failure to decide an application which relates to a **condition**, we must have a copy of the original permission with the condition attached. 10
- 11 Any relevant **correspondence** with the LPA. 11

L. OTHER APPEALS

See section L of the guidance leaflet.

If you have sent other appeals for this or nearby sites to us and these have not been decided, please give details and our reference numbers.

CONCURRENT APPEAL AGAINST THE REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE SAME DEVELOPMENT

M. CHECK SIGN AND DATE

See section M of the guidance leaflet.

Please tick the boxes to confirm that the following actions have been carried out

- 1 I have completed all sections of the form and the details of the ownership (sections J) are correct to the best of my knowledge.
- 2 I have enclosed **all** the essential supporting documents listed in section k.
- 3 I have sent a copy of this appeal form and relevant documents to the LPA (if you do not we will not normally accept your appeal).
- 4 I have signed and dated the form (unsigned forms will be returned to you).

Signature Alan Croston Date 30/9/15

Name (in capitals) ALAN D. CROSTON On behalf of (if applicable)



The gathering and subsequent processing of the personal data supplied by you in this form, is in accordance with the terms of our registration under the Data Protection Act 1998. Further information about our Data Protection policy can be found in the guidance leaflet.

N. NOW SEND

Remember, it is your responsibility to make sure that we RECEIVE your appeal form and ALL supporting documents within the 6 month time limit. See section N of the guidance leaflet.

Send THIS form (not a photocopy of it) to us at:

The Planning Inspectorate
Registry/Scanning Team
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Helpline: 0303 444 5000

Send a copy to the LPA

Send a copy of the appeal form to the address from which the decision notice was sent (or to the address shown on any letters received from the LPA). There is no need to send them all the documents again; send them any supporting documents not previously sent as part of the application. If you do not send them a copy of this form and documents, we may not accept your appeal.

You may wish to keep a copy of the completed appeal form for your records

When we receive your appeal form, we will write to you letting you know if your appeal is valid, who is dealing with it and what happens next.

FULL STATEMENT OF CASE

Appeal by Mr L Morris against the decisions of Ribble Valley Borough Council to refuse planning permission and listed building consent for a single storey rear extension and creation of a walled back garden at Wolfen Hall, Chipping, Lancashire, PR3 2NZ

Planning Application reference 3/2015/0517 decision date 5 August 2015
Listed Building Consent reference 3/2015/0518 decision date 10 September 2015

These applications are identical and were submitted in June 2015 by Sunderland Peacock and Associates, Chartered Architects who are experienced practitioners in this area. The application was accompanied by a Heritage Statement by Stephen Haigh MA who is an experienced Building Archaeologist based in the north of England. This appeal statement is by Alan D Croston who is a Chartered Town Planner with 46 years planning experience in Lancashire and who has walked on footpaths close to the house on many occasions.

This is a **common statement** as there are two appeals generated by the two applications for the same proposal.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

1. Wolfen Hall is a substantial mainly two storey farmhouse lying 2km from Chipping village. Together with several outbuildings and a gamekeepers cottage it forms an Estate responsible for the management of about 860 acres of surrounding land including the grouse moor of Wolf Fell (445 acres) and grassland, moorland, woodland and ponds. The Hall stands at the south west end of the farm group and comprises a single dwelling, created from the amalgamation of the farmhouse with other adjoining buildings which have been much altered and extended in recent years. It is stone built with a blue slate roof, with the main range, which has a twin span roof reflecting the building's double depth plan, stepped down in height to the north east. There are trees scattered around the property plus a new woodland to the rear.

2. The applications are to erect a single storey extension at the rear north-east side corner of the house composed of matching stone, slate and glass; and to erect two lengths of 1.8m high stone wall to enclose a space about 20 metres by 7 metres to form a rectangular shaped rear garden for the house. Two doorways created by converting two windows into doors will give access from the Victorian rear wall of the house on to this area. There is an anomaly on the submitted plans as these doors are shown on the Architects sketch and on plan but not on the north elevation. If this means that there would need to be a revised proposal to cover these particular works then the appellant acknowledges the situation.

HERITAGE ASSETS

3. There is one specific asset in the form of Wolfen Hall. It has been listed as a building of special architectural and historic interest (Grade II) since 1983. From the description the main significance of this asset lies in its older internal features. It is described in the list as:-

House, possibly C16th, altered 1867-8. Slobbered rubble with steep slate roof. 2 storeys, 2 bays, with end stacks. Windows have plain stone surrounds with wooden casements. The door between the bays has plain reveals. The chimney caps have copings and weathered offsets. At the rear is a parallel range which appears to be of a later date. Interior: the right hand room has, in its rear wall, a blocked 5-light tall wooden mullion window with wooden lintel and sill and splayed wooden jambs. Between the hall and the left hand room is a timber framed wall which rises through the first floor. A main post, against the front wall of the house, is tenoned into the tie beam at 1st floor ceiling level. The rear wall of the left hand room, separating it from the stair hall at the rear, is also timber framed with many redundant peg holes suggesting re-use or reconstruction. Between the entrance hall and stair hall is a chamfered wooden door surround with 4-centred head. The dog-leg stair has been reconstructed but retains its C17th handrail and moulded newel. A stone wall, now dividing the rear wing but formerly an external wall, has a blocked window with wooden mullions. A drawing in the Weld collection at the Harris Art Gallery in Preston and dated 1841, shows the house extending further to the right (north-east) where a later C19th extension now adjoins. The drawing also shows a chamfered doorway with an ogee head. This feature is not necessarily of medieval date.

Smith, T C History of Chipping, Preston, 1894, p. 226

4. It should be noted that the Planning Guidance definition of significance is:- The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its *heritage interest*. That interest may be archaeological/architectural/artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage assets presence but also from its setting.

5. Therefore it is a material consideration that the site also lies in the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This large AONB was designated in 1964 and covers about 803 sq km in Lancashire and Yorkshire. The primary purpose of this AONB designation is to conserve and enhance *natural beauty*. Much of this beauty is related to the wild nature of the landscape – itself a result of hundreds of years of human activity. It is therefore a living landscape and with a resident population of about 16,000. Its key characteristics are high moorland, grassland, farms, houses and villages. Managing the land for game hunting, primarily grouse shooting, has remained a predominant influence on the landscape. Wolfen Hall is part of that management and is an independent group of buildings set at the foot of moorland to the north and is primarily viewed against that backdrop. That position remains unchanged by this application.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

6. Although the report of the Officer delegated to decide this proposal is a single joint one, the reasons given in the two decisions notices are not the same. In addition to reasoning within the text of this statement, in the conclusion there is a summary of why the Council's reasons are not justified.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

NPPF

7. Para 17 is part of the Government's broad 12 core land use planning principles. The Framework seeks to "conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations". Following the advice of the NPPF in para 128 the applicant commissioned a report using the appropriate expertise and including the level of detail proportionate to the assets' importance to assess the significance of the heritage asset affected, and that report concluded that the scheme was an acceptable one which would not harm the character or significance of the asset and therefore complies with para 17.

8. Only the decision notice on 0517 says there is non compliance with NPPF para 115 . The notice introduces a matter of cultural heritage in the AONB. This is not defined , nor covered in Local Plan/Core Strategy policies. What para 115 says is that in AONBs conserving landscape and scenic beauty is important. It also goes on to say that the conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations. If the Council is saying that there is an impact on cultural heritage (however defined) as well as on heritage and on landscape then they have not identified what it is, and we do not accept there is a separate policy element here which this tiny proposal affects. Cultural heritage is normally defined as including *intangibles* and in this case the local culture includes the long term management of grouse moorland as a key component of the character of this part of the AONB, and the proposal actually supports the only local premises which deliver this. It is therefore in tune with the cultural heritage of the area.

9. Para 131 of the NPPF says it is desirable that heritage assets are put to a viable use consistent with their conservation. The farmhouse is already part of an important use as the main dwelling on a 860 acre estate which manages moorland and countryside in a sustainable way. The house has been significantly adapted and extended over the years in pursuit of that function. Ensuring that the house can be occupied by the appropriate persons to enable the function to continue and be economically viable is very important. The proposal is not new development in terms of the third bullet point of this paragraph.

10. The main significance of the house is its older internal features. These are not affected by the proposal. We believe the second pile was only added to the house in the major rebuilding in 1867-8. It is only two small areas of the

1867-8 rear wall beneath existing windows will be removed to deepen the openings so that doors can be inserted, and in our experience this rear wall appears to have been rebuilt since its creation. There is no loss of the older fabric. The two lengths of 1.8m garden wall are near this rear wall, but as the applicant's specialist assessment found – "the exterior of the house particularly to the rear has a relatively modern and undistinguished appearance which contributes very little to the building's significance". It is at this north-east end of the building that the single storey extension is sought, and apart from it being a very natural extension of the building form already present, the submitted assessment found in relation to significance, that "the north-east end of the building appears to date entirely from the 1860s and the 150 years following, and is barely recognisable as the former farm building it once was". The proposals will not harm the significance of the building and will contribute to its conservation and so meet the intention of para 132.

CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

11. The Council has adopted a Core Strategy, but before responding to the policies quoted in the refusal notices, it's worth a look at the relevant Key Statements which set the scene for the policies. Key Statement EN2 Landscape – wants to protect, conserve and enhance the landscape and character of the AONB. The Council will "expect development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, features and building materials". The text at para 5.3 amplifies this by seeking high standards of design and by ensuring that open countryside is protected from inappropriate development. As 75% of the Borough is AONB these general requirements are widespread and the appeal proposal is modest being a small garden and a single storey house extension in matching stone/slate. The extension is well designed but demonstrates a subservient 'outbuilding' feel as it naturally continues northwards the existing single storey element of the house – which itself used to be an annex. Thus it is very much in keeping.

12.. The Architect's response to the context is for a matching sandstone and slate structure which blends in in general terms, but with its glazing, it would remain visible and legible as an addition to the house. It would be slightly narrower than the gable which it would adjoin with its roof line just below the existing. The end gable is fully glazed to give the impression of an open ended building which flows into the countryside. The glazing would be acceptable because of the extensions modest scale and because of the distance from the historic core of the house. The extension relates primarily to the Victorian rear elevation. In terms of size and scale the extension is obviously subordinate to the main range and would not compromise the setting of the house.

13. By allowing the farmhouse use to continue with more modern space for users, this ensures that there is a viable use which encourages occupation and thus facilitates the management and conservation of the surrounding 860 acre estate whose character is part of the AONB. The Key Statements also seek to conserve and enhance in a manner appropriate to the significance of

the heritage value and to avoid any substantial harm to the heritage asset – which this scheme complies with. Therefore the proposal has full regard to both Key Statement EN2 and to its companion Key Statement EN5 Heritage Assets.

14. Included in the Core Strategy are Development Management Policies. DMG1 covers General Considerations relating to all development throughout the Borough. It is a comprehensive list of requirements including design, access, amenity and environment. The proposal is well designed, there are no amenity considerations applying here, and there are no nature conservation interests involved. In relation to heritage, DMG1 exhorts that “all development must protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings”. The Heritage Statement submitted with the application in compliance with para 128 of the NPPF demonstrates that this requirement is met.

15. Policy DMG2 is referred to in the notice on 0517 but this policy relates only to Strategic Considerations in delivering the development strategy for the Borough as envisaged in the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy. It is not relevant to a house extension.

16. Protecting Heritage Assets DME4 makes reference to Listed Buildings and says that “proposals which cause harm to their significance will not be supported”. We have demonstrated that the proposal does not cause harm to the significance of the asset. The Policy also seeks to avoid the “loss of important historic fabric”. Again the proposal affects only two tiny areas of wall in the Victorian rear wall which are not important elements of fabric. The proposal therefore complies with this Policy.

17. Finally, Policy DMH5, *inter alia*, indicates the policy on curtilage extensions. This appears to be driven by the avoidance of “significant impact upon visual amenity and patterns of land use”, and to ensure “the impact of any proposals can be clearly assessed”. Obviously any proposal has to be properly assessed and we provide a response below of our view on this topic. However as a preliminary point based on our experience we would draw attention to the fact that here, as on many farms, the residential curtilage is not exclusively defined. Many farmsteads share space in a yard, or adjacent land is used for a combination of residential and farm business. There is not usually a need to define an exclusively residential curtilage as most active farmers “live on the farm” rather than simply in a dwelling.

PLANNING HISTORY

18. For the past 30 years the Council have been willing to approve changes, alterations and extensions at the farmstead. In the 32 years since the house was listed I have identified approval to eleven separate proposals on site. On the house alone there have been five schemes which created extensions or made significant physical changes. For example in 1990 these included bringing ancillary space into living accommodation – with alterations- and so extending the house eastwards. Then in 1995 the house gable and chimney

was rebuilt including three new windows. A major extension in 1999 (8.7m x 4.6m x 2 storey) extended the second pile eastwards to join up with a projecting single storey extension thus solidifying the footprint and at the same time making numerous internal changes. Subsequently where a garage door adorned the front elevation further works were undertaken to create a living room (now hall) . On to this a new porch was added earlier this year having been allowed on appeal in 2014. (APP/T2350/E/14/2213092). We would draw attention to the high quality of construction in this new porch which indicates the standard which the appellant will adopt in any further new work.

19. So the planning history since listing in 1983 is one of continuous change and evolution of the form of the house.

RESPONSES TO THE REFUSAL

Form

20. This is not a traditional linear upland farmhouse where the house was adjoined by a barn/shippon, often located on the moorland edge in Lancashire. As the frontier of agriculture pushed higher in the late 18th century – sometimes up to 1000 ft AOD - marginal farms were created most of which have ceased farming today. Wolfen Hall at only 600ft is different both culturally and physically such that the Councils approach to their decision is flawed. They seek to safeguard an upland vernacular which is no longer present and was in any event one that took many varying physical forms - not just linear (Brunskill p 147 Illustrated Handbook of Vernacular Architecture).

21. The site of Wolfen Hall is believed to be that of a 13th century farmhouse according to Lancashire's Archaeological Record. At the time of proposed new building work on site in 1990 the concern of the Archaeologists was to have a watching brief for early remains and a planning condition was imposed to that effect. The record does not say if anything was found. By the 14th century it was a Manor House being the home of the Manor of Chipping, later passing into the hands of the Knolls of Shireburnes whence rebuilding is believed to have taken place. Certainly this area of northern England saw a major wave of house rebuilding in the period 1670 to 1720 so it is likely. A large Estate of land appears to have continued to be attached to the Hall even though for a time it became reduced to a tenanted farm. The 1841 sketch by John Weld (Lancashire Archives) appears to show a 17th century form of dwelling and it is possible that it is the relics of this which are found internally with blocked windows/fireplace/timber frame.

22. The History of Chipping published by T Smith in 1894 confirms that extensive alterations were carried out to the house in 1867-8 including the addition of new farm buildings at its north-east end. This rebuilding and refacing of the house lost a lot of the vernacular character. The new farm buildings were altered again in later years and then became incorporated into the house in the 1990s. The resulting modern elevations particularly at the rear of the house are bland and contribute very little to the building's significance. The group of agricultural buildings to the east have themselves

been altered over time and present a predominantly modern and significant appearance.

23. Arthur Raistrick in his 1981 *Buildings in the Yorkshire Dales* notes that even where there are longhouses (as farmhouses) they would not necessarily be built at a single time as extra bays would be added for example as sons married or farms prospered. By the middle of the C17th the addition of service rooms in a single storey off-shut at the back and a porch at the front became fairly common. This seems to have happened at Wolfen Hall as the porch appeal found that there had been a porch on the front elevation which had subsequently gone. Also the planning history shows the building layout here included a well established single storey extension at the rear north-east corner of the building (which became largely absorbed by the 1999 approved extension). It is the northern end of this extension onto which the current proposed extension will be grafted recreating the shape which existed prior to 1999. Therefore the proposed outrigger is consistent with the established form, consistent with history, and echoes what existed when first listed.

Amenity

24. The Council has taken the view that the extensions are prominent and conspicuous but that is definitely not the reality. Council Officers cannot have carried out a proper site assessment to reach the judgement they have. The two tarmac lanes leading to the property from the south and west respectively are private. So public views are only available from public footpaths or from distant Access Land including Parlick. Approached from the south the view is directly ahead to the front of the house with no view of the rear. The house is in fact set down below a slight slope when viewed from the west, so a persons view is over the site allowing only a distant sight of the roof of the extension against a backdrop of the other buildings on site. The east-west footpath in front of the house has been diverted away from the frontage so only a glimpse along the existing gables is available so the extension or walls would not be noticeable. From the footpath to the east of the farm the existing agricultural buildings and tower silo screen the view and anything glimpsed is as part of a group of buildings.

25. There are very distant views of the group of buildings from the access land moorland to the north and from the path above Saddle End Farm but these viewpoints are too far away to distinguish the elements now proposed, which in any event would be seen against the existing buildings, and furthermore, trees help to foil the view. The proposals are therefore well contained from public viewpoints and harmonise with the group of buildings such that they are not readily seen nor do they significantly affect the landscape or the setting of the house. Therefore there is no impact on the Forest of Bowland AONB.

Curtilage

26. If the land proposed to be walled is not curtilage now then the erection of walls on farmland would not need planning permission. This indicates the minor nature of the works proposed and the normal acceptability of this scale

of development. Although the Hall is listed, there is no direct impact on the house by having two lengths of wall outside at the back. Already there are two walled areas accompanying the house. A walled garden adjoins the western half of the front of the house. Meanwhile a detached area to the east of the main approach drive has been externally walled with a dry stone wall up to 1.5 metres high – as approved by the Council in 1998 – to form an area of grassed garden. We assume this is now part of the curtilage? Evidence submitted to the Council with the appeal applications suggests that gardens may have adjoined the buildings in the 1840s. The 1840 Chipping Tithe map defines a plot (plot 233) which extends to the rear of the house where it was enclosed within an angled boundary and described as “house, fold, garden and barn”, but at present rough grassland runs up to the main rear elevation of the house.

27. The proposed rear garden would enhance the appearance of the house and setting as it would have traditional dry-stone boundary walls, be of an appropriate size and fit in well with the proposed extension along one side. Rear gardens and yards are probably more the rule than the exception for farmhouses in the region. Although at present the land is open, historically that might not always have been the case. The Council argue that the way the uncultivated land continues up to the house is an aspect worthy of retention, but in support of this cites a document concerned with the conversion of farm buildings rather than established dwellings. However the Hall is not a former outbuilding but an historic dwelling which can be expected to be embellished and enhanced to some degree by domestic surroundings.

28. It is also important to ensure that the farmhouse remains occupiable in the modern era. The two sections of matching dry stone wall proposed will give security and amenity space to the occupiers and their family members. It will also provide a sense of containment and a modicum of weather protection and will enhance the setting by contributing a domestic curtilage in a sympathetic form not currently available. The applicant is happy to accept a planning condition excluding domestic permitted development structures to avoid any risk of suburbanisation within the defined space.

CONCLUSIONS

29. The allegations in the Council’s refusal notice are not supported by the evidence. The proposal is neither prominent nor conspicuous being behind the house, well screened and contained from public viewpoints. The design form of the extension recreates that of the former outrigger in this location so represents a natural siting for the extension. It has matching stone and a subservient slated roof. The included glazing simply creates a more open structure and has a neutral effect being at a distance from the main building. As the evidence shows the Hall has grown substantially and organically over the years so is typical of how such houses change. This further element does not affect the vernacular, rather it complements what has been happening for centuries. The house today does not display a typical agricultural character

which might be affected by the proposal– it has the feel of a more substantial house and does not display a typical farmhouse form.

30. The proposed walling is not prominent in any viewpoint. At 1.8m high it is seen with the adjoining buildings and outbuildings. Walling occurs at the front of the premises and fits in well with the character. There is no evidence to support the Council's assertion that the wall would enclose an important space. This small area has no other functional role and it is reasonable that the occupiers could have a garden area here. The appellants evidence is that this area was not necessarily always open, and historically in the region there is a variety of layouts such that to enclose the area would neither be out of character nor harmful to the building or its setting in any way.

Finally-

31. The Inspector deciding the porch appeal last year helpfully noted in his decision letter that the front porch would be "*a substantial addition to the house but it would not harm the significance of the listed building and would add to its character rather than detract from it*". In para 5 he said that "*as the Council accepts, most historic buildings show evolution and adaption and this is part of their special historic and architectural interest*". He also commented that "*as the C19th porch reflected the use and adaptation of the house during parts of its history so would the proposed porch in the 21st century*". This approach to change is correct and is echoed by the English Heritage Listing Selection Guide which says that "*listing does not preclude the allowing of sympathetic alterations; modern changes, in time, can themselves add to the continuing story of a house's history*". Despite losing the porch appeal, this concept of organic change over time which is present at Wolfen Hall in spades, seems an anathema to the present Council. Yet it is in accordance with the natural order of things as the site's history demonstrates, and as previous Council decisions correctly accepted. The Inspector is respectfully requested to allow the appeals.

Alan D Croston BA(Hons) MRTPI
Chartered Town Planner
Arley House
Mellor
BB2 7NP

September 2015

Appeals by Mr L Morris at Wolfen Hall, Chipping, Lancashire PR3 2NZ

APPENDIX 1 - DOCUMENTS SUPPLIED TO THE INSPECTORATE

A. LISTED BUILDING APPEAL

- 1 Copy of Listed Building Consent Application Forms ref 3/2015/0518 including Certificate
- 2 Decision Notice on 3/2015/0518
- 3 A copy set of submitted drawings, photos and illustration
- 4 A copy of the Heritage Statement which accompanied the application
- 5 A copy of the previous appeal on site ref APP/T2350/E/14/2213092
- 6 A site location plan at a scale of 1:25000
- 7 The Full Statement of Case covering both appeals

B. PLANNING APPEAL

- 1 Copy of Planning Application Forms including certificate ref 3/2015/0517
- 2 Decision notice on 3/2015/0517
- 3 A copy set of the submitted drawings etc (which are identical to 0518)
- 4 A copy of the Heritage Statement as above
- 5 A site location plan at a scale of 1:25000
- 6 The Full Statement of Case covering both appeals

September 2015