

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2016

**by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 4<sup>th</sup> November 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/W/16/3151566**

**Field Barn, Old Langho Road, Langho, Lancashire, BB6 8AW**

- 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 Craig Robinson against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 3/2016/0241, dated 2 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2016.
  - The development proposed is a garage/annex building and stable block within the residential curtilage.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the garage/annex building. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the stable block and planning permission is granted for a stable block at Field Barn, Old Langho Road, Langho, Lancashire, BB6 8AW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/2016/0241, dated 2 March 2016, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted, and subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: PHD/FB 100.
  - 3) No development shall take place above slab level until samples of all external facing materials have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The relevant works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved sample details.
  - 4) The stable block hereby approved shall only be used for private recreational purposes incidental to the dwelling at Field Barn.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

3. The appeal site is currently occupied by a former barn that has recently been converted into a dwelling. There are currently no other outbuildings around the barn, and it is in a relatively isolated location in the open countryside.
-

- Despite its large footprint the barn is a relatively squat structure with a low ridge height. The later additions are also mostly single storey in height.
4. The former barn has been significantly altered and extended under recent permissions, and it now has the appearance of a medium-sized detached property. Whilst it is currently an isolated structure in the landscape, I do not consider that the introduction of outbuildings would be harmful per se, provided these are of an appropriate design and sympathetic to the rural setting.
  5. The proposed stable block would be a low single storey building of wooden construction. It would be modest in stature and subservient to the existing dwelling. It would also be of a design and development type that would be typical of a rural location, and it would be in keeping with the surrounding rural landscape. It would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area in my view.
  6. The proposed garage / annexe building would be taller and more imposing in stature. In particular, it would be higher than the eaves of the existing dwelling and the recent additions to the original barn. Due to its size, height, and position, it would not be subservient to the existing dwelling and would appear overly dominant. In addition, its design would be domestic in appearance, and it would have a disproportionately sized garage door. It would therefore not be sympathetic to either the existing dwelling or the wider area. Whilst the land that the building would occupy is currently used for car parking, this has a lesser impact on the appearance of the area than the proposed garage / annexe building. Furthermore, the recent approvals to extend the original barn are not comparable to the current appeal proposal, as these are single storey subordinate additions to the existing dwelling.
  7. The development would have only limited visibility from public vantage points. However, this does not justify the introduction of harmful new development into the open countryside.
  8. In addition, I do not consider that the proposal would represent urban encroachment into the countryside. The proposed buildings would not be particularly suburban in design, and their combined footprint would not be so extensive as to constitute an urbanisation of the site.
  9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed garage / annexe building would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (2014).
  10. Separately, I conclude that the proposed stable block would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be in accordance with Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (2014).
  11. In coming to that view I have had regard to the appellant's comments regarding the applicability of Policy DMG2. Whilst this policy relates to strategic considerations, it requires that development in the open countryside is of an appropriate size and design, and is in keeping with the character of the landscape. This policy is therefore of direct relevance to the appeal proposal.

### **Conditions**

12. The Council suggested a number of conditions, some of which I have edited for clarity and enforceability. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition that requires the development to accord with the approved plan. This is necessary for clarity and to ensure a satisfactory development. The submitted drawings do not specify the details of the materials to be used, including their colour. I have therefore imposed a condition that requires samples of all external facing materials to be submitted and approved. This condition is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area. I have also imposed a further condition requiring that the stable block is only used for purposes incidental to the dwelling at Field Barn. This is necessary to ensure that the building is not used for commercial purposes, in the interests of residential amenity.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed in part and dismissed in part.

*Thomas Hatfield*

INSPECTOR