



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2017

**by Mike Worden BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 02 November 2017**

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/3177455**

### **Fields Farm Barn, Back Lane, Chipping PR3 2QA**

- 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 Derek Balchin against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 3/2017/0308, dated 29 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2017.
  - The development proposed is formation of new window openings in existing dwelling
- 

## **Decision**

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the formation of new window openings in the existing dwelling at Fields Farm Barn, Back Lane, Chipping PR3 2QA, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/2017/0308, dated 29 March 2017, 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 plans: Location Plan 0502/93 Drawing No 00; Existing Site Plan 0502/93 Drawing No 05A; Existing Plans and Elevations 0502/93 Drawing No 05, Proposed Plans and Elevations 0502/93 Drawing No 10.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

## **Procedural Matter**

2. Part of the proposal involves the insertion of a new rooflight into the roof on the elevation of the appeal property furthest away from the farmhouse. This is marked as the north west elevation on the plans, but I believe this is the south west elevation. The existing plan<sup>1</sup> does not show any rooflights on the roof of that elevation. On my site visit however, I noticed that there was a rooflight in place on the roof above the door, albeit in a slightly higher position than shown on the submitted proposed plan<sup>2</sup>.
3. I also noticed that there were two additional rooflights on the roof of that elevation and a porch, which are not shown on the submitted plans.

---

<sup>1</sup> Existing Plans and Elevations 0502/93 Drawing No 5

<sup>2</sup> Proposed Plans and Elevations 0502/93 Drawing No 10

Furthermore the proposed window to be inserted into an already formed window opening on the south east elevation was already in place. I have based my decision on the submitted plans.

### **Main Issue**

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.

### **Reasons**

5. The appeal property is a converted barn formerly associated with Fields Farm. The farmhouse and the barn are now separate residential dwellings. The farmhouse is a Grade 2 listed building. The barn and the farmhouse lie next to each other at the end of a farm track within open countryside and within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). A public footpath runs close to the site.
6. The proposed development would create new window openings on the main south east elevation and a new rooflight on the elevation furthest away from the farmhouse. An existing window on the north east elevation would be infilled.
7. The appeal property has retained much of its character as a former stone agricultural barn, with a main central barn with a high roof and smaller lean to elements either side. It has a number of domestic elements within its curtilage including a garage, a garden and a parking area. Given its size, height and location, it is visible not only from the public footpath but from various parts of Longridge Road. Its construction and design is typical of a number of stone agricultural buildings in the area and it makes an important contribution to the landscape of the AONB.
8. However in such views, it is the bulkier central part of the barn which tends to be more visible, especially the high roof and the large, already glazed, central opening. The two side elements are less visible although their sloping roofs are noticeable in the landscape as they contrast and balance the main barn roof.
9. The proposed rooflight is a minor addition to the roof of the side elevation of the appeal property and I consider that it would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the property.
10. The small higher window openings of the side elements of the appeal property are consistent with the character and appearance of the property as a former barn, and therefore I consider that the window proposed in the existing window opening on the south east elevation would not be harmful to its character and appearance.
11. The new proposed window on the central part of the barn would introduce symmetry to that elevation, increase the number of openings, and affect the glazing to solid ratio. However, given its size and that it reflects the design and relationship of the existing openings on that elevation, I consider that the window would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property.
12. The proposed larger full length glazed window, which would replace the existing square window, would increase the ratio of opening/glazing to solid

wall. Although this part of the proposal would mirror the other side of this elevation, I do not consider that this would create a domestic form or be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building overall.

13. Taken as a whole the proposed alterations to the south east elevation whilst introducing symmetry and additional glazing, would not, in my view, unduly harm the character and appearance of the converted and modernised barn. From the public right of way and in the wider landscape, the main elements of the building such as its central block, the high roof, the large glazed central opening and the sloping and subservient roofs of the two side elements, would remain as the prominent features.
14. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling or the area and would accord with Policies DMG1, DME2 and DMH5 of the *Core Strategy 2008-2028 A Local Plan for Ribble Valley*. These policies respectively set out general considerations for the determination of planning applications, seek to secure the protection of landscape and townscape features, and seek to secure good design in residential and curtilage extensions.
15. I also consider that the proposed development would accord with the fourth bullet point of paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure that developments respond well to local character and history. The Council's officer's report refers to the *Forest of Bowland AONB Landscape Character Assessment 2009*. The quote from it relates to the modernisation of farmsteads through the use of non-local building materials. I have given this report limited weight in my decision as it is not a policy document and the proposal relates to an already modernised farm building.

#### *Other matters*

16. The appeal site lies adjacent to the listed farmhouse. However the appeal site and the listed building are quite separate and the proposal relates to the elevations which face away from the farmhouse. Having regard to Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I consider that the proposed development would preserve the setting of Fields Farmhouse.

#### **Conditions**

17. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework. In addition to the standard time condition for implementation, there is a need for conditions specifying the plans to which the permission relates in the interests of certainty and clarity; and to require the use of matching materials in the interests of character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.

#### **Conclusion**

18. For the reasons given above, and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Mike Worden*

INSPECTOR