



Appeal Under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

**Glebe Barn,
Main Street,
Gisburn,
Clitheroe
BB7 4HR**

Full Planning Application for the erection of a double-garage and store on land west of Glebe Barn

Application Reference: 3/2021/0469

APPEAL STATEMENT OF CASE

August 2021



PWA Planning is a trading name of Paul Walton Associates Ltd.
Registered in England and Wales no. 8605706. Registered Address:
316 Blackpool Road, Fulwood, Preston PR2 3AE

2 Lockside Office Park
Lockside Road
Preston
PR2 2YS

01772 369 669
info@pwaplanning.co.uk
www.pwaplanning.co.uk

REPORT CONTROL

Document	Written Appeal Statement
Project	Glebe Barn, Gisburn
Client	Andrew Weir
Job Number	20-1074
File storage	Z:\Client files\21-1002 to 21-\21-1074 Glebe Barn, Gisburn\4. Appeal

Document Checking

Primary Author:	Olivia McQuaid	Initialled:	OM
Contributor:	Mike Sproston	Initialled:	MS
Reviewer:	Graeme Thorpe	Initialled:	GT

Revision Status

Issue	Date	Status	Checked for issue
1	28.07.2021	Initial Draft	GT
2	05.08.2021	Draft V2	MS
3	06.08.2021	Draft V3	GT
4	06.08.2021	Final	GT

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION
---	--------------

2	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT & BACKGROUND
---	-----------------------------------

3	RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY
---	--------------------------

4	CASE FOR THE APPELLANT
---	------------------------

5	CONCLUSION
---	------------

Appendix A Officers Report

Appendix B Decision Notice

Appendix C Plans and Elevations

Appendix D Planning Statement

Appendix E Heritage Statement

/1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. PWA Planning is retained by Andrew Weir ('the appellant') to lodge an appeal against the refusal of planning application for the '*the erection of a double-garage and store*' on land west of Glebe Barn, Main Street, Gisburn, Clitheroe, Lancashire, BB7 4HR, ('the site') by Ribble Valley Borough Council ('the Council').
- 1.2. The full planning application was received by the Council on 30th April 2021 and subsequently registered on 3rd June 2021, with the application accompanied by the appropriate plans and supporting information. The application was subsequently refused at Planning Committee on 20th July 2021, with the formal decision notice issued on 23rd July 2021.
- 1.3. The application had one reason for refusal, which is provided on the attached decision notice (Appendix B). In brief, the reason for refusal related to the development resulting in development that would harm the character and appearance of Gisburn Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings, due to the size, form and sitting of the proposal.
- 1.4. This appeal statement, made under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, has been prepared against the refusal. It should be read in conjunction with the other submitted documents and drawings that formed part of the original planning application.

/2 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT & BACKGROUND

Existing Site

- 2.1. The application site comprises of an area of land to the west of Glebe Barn, within the garden curtilage of Glebe Barn, shown in Figure 1 below.



Figure 1: Street view of the application site, red arrow indicates where proposed garage would be (Source: Google Maps)

- 2.2. The site lies within the Gisburn and Rimington ward of Ribble Valley Borough Council's administrative boundaries, with the site lying upon 'Main Street' (A59 Road). The A59 road is a major national routeway which runs from Merseyside to North Yorkshire, passing through the centre of Gisburn.

- 2.3. The land is located to the southwest of The Vicarage, which is identified as a building of townscape merit within the Gisburn Conservation Area Appraisal.
- 2.4. The site is sustainably located within the centre of Gisburn, with access into the site proposed from the A59 (Main Street) to the immediate south of the site, while the A682 (Hellifield Road) lies to the west of the site, beyond the site's boundaries
- 2.5. The surrounds are generally residential consisting of a mixture of different types of dwellings within the Gisburn Conservation Area. Grade II Listed St Mary's Gisburn lies to the west of the site on the far side of Hellifield Road.
- 2.6. There are no ecological designations associated with the site and the site is not part of a Mineral Safeguarding Area. There are no Public Right of Ways which exists upon, or near to the site and is located predominately within Flood Zone 1, where the risk of flooding is at its lowest.
- 2.7. The Officer's Report, which is provided at Appendix A:
 - a) Identified there to have been no objections from statutory consultees that could not be overcome via conditions attached to the grant of planning permission;
 - b) Considers that the proposals contradict Key Statement EN5, and do not comply with Policies DME4 and DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Development Proposal

- 2.8. The proposed development comprised of the erection of a double garage on the land to the immediate west of the existing dwelling known as Glebe Barn, which lies along Main Street (A59). With regards to the proposed access there is an existing dropped kerb and access from Main Street to provide infrastructure for the occupants to store their vehicles and equipment safely. Accordingly, significant highway works, or alterations are unnecessary in this case.

- 2.9. The proposed development intended to erect a small stone garage, with a slated, and apex-shaped roof. The proposed building materials were chosen to complement the existing Glebe Barn, the boundary walling, and neighbouring buildings, including multiple buildings along Main Street.
- 2.10. Overall, the scale and massing of the proposed stone garage was to be lesser than the existing Glebe Barn adjacent to the proposed site, to ensure that it appears to be subservient to the property. Moreover, the proposed garage was to be located within a portion of the site contains multiple mature trees and hedgerows which would help to screen the garage from the adjacent highway networks; thus, ensuring a minimal impact upon the street scene.
- 2.11. The garage will also feature three garage doors to the easter facade, which will help to break-up the materials used on the frontage and increase the amount of natural light within the development.
- 2.12. The garage will mostly compromise of a garage with a smaller section to the north of the development proposed to use to store gardening equipment.

Planning History

- 2.13. The site and its immediate surroundings have been subject to a planning history search on Ribble Valleys Borough Council's planning register. The following applications documented below highlight that previous development has been granted for the development of garages and residential uses within this immediate vicinity as such it is anticipated that this proposal will sit well within the site and surroundings.

- Application Number: 3/1991/0736

Proposal: Conversion of Barns into two dwelling and parish room

Location: Gisburn Park Estates Ltd, Glebe Barns, Main Street, Gisburn

Decision: Approved

- Application Number: 3/2019/1096

Proposal: Change of use of land to extend domestic curtilage. Erection of garage and store.

Location: Shepherds View Skipton Road Gisburn BD23 3JP

Decision: Approved with conditions

- Application Number: 3/2019/0693

Proposal: Change of use of garage/ancillary residential building to a single dwelling.

Location: Newfield Edge Farm Burnley Road Gisburn BB7 4JN

Decision: Approved with conditions

- Application Number: 3/2017/0788

Proposal: Demolition of existing open barn and erection of double garage.

Location: Home Farm Gisburn Road Gisburn

Decision: Approved with conditions

- Application Number: 3/2016/0499

Proposal: Proposed erection of a double garage and garden store building

Location: The Old Vicarage Hellifield Road Gisburn BB7 4HQ

Decision: Approved with conditions

- Application Number: 3/1989/0691

Proposal: Listed Building Consent for Detached Double Garage

Location: Snowhill House, Main Street, Gisburn

Decision: Approved

- Application Number: 3/1989/0811

Proposal: Demolition of Outbuildings and replacement garage

Location: The Vicarage, Main Street, Gisburn

Decision: Approved

- 2.14. The approval of these applications demonstrates that supplementary residential development of similar smaller scale properties located on the same street have been deemed acceptable and appropriately located among the surroundings.
- 2.15. The approval for the erection of a garage at The Vicarage (Ref: 3/1989) holds particular significance given the site itself is identified as an important feature holding Townscape Merit within the Gisburn Conservation Area Appraisal and determined the development would not negatively impact the area of the despite being protected under Article 4. This development features a white door that is of significant difference to the existing property, though was determined acceptable.
- 2.16. The garage put forward in the application subject to this appeal is of a similar size to the above approved applications, while it too would serve the same purpose. Therefore, the proposals should be seen to sit well within the site and the surroundings, with the proposals mirroring multiple other nearby dwellings which have garages to support the reduction of on street parking.

13 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

- 3.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that *'If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise'* including any supplementary / supporting planning documents and government guidance as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019).

Development Plan

- 3.2 The Development Plan for the application site comprises of the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy 2008-2028 (2014) and the Housing and Economic Development DPD (adopted 2014).
- 3.3 The Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy was adopted in December 2014, and it sets out the strategic planning policy framework to guide development in the borough up to 2028. It also includes development management policies to assist in the determination of individual planning applications.
- 3.4 The Officer's Report (included in Appendix A) makes reference to the following planning policies in relation to the application:

The Ribble Valley Borough Council Adopted Core Strategy (2014).

- Policy DMG1: General Considerations
 - Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets
- 3.5 Reference was also made to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

3.6 Further considerations were made regarding the supplementary Gisburn Conservation Area Appraisal and National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).

3.7 Within the Decision Notice, the Council refers to the following Core Strategy Key Statements and policies within the reason for refusal:

Key Statement EN5 – Heritage Assets

3.8 The statement details how the council will adopt a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of the significance of heritage assets and their settings. The statement sets out how the historic environment and heritage assets will be conserved through:

- *Recognising that the best way of ensuring the long-term protection of heritage assets is to ensure a viable use that optimises opportunities for sustaining and enhancing its significance.*
- *Keeping Conservation Area Appraisals under review to ensure that any development proposals respect and safeguard the character, appearance, and significance of the area.*
- *Considering any development proposals which may impact on a heritage asset or their setting through seeking benefits that conserve and enhance their significance and avoids any substantial harm to the heritage asset.*
Requiring all development proposals to make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness/sense of place.
- *The consideration of Article 4 Directions to restrict permitted development rights where the exercise of such rights would harm the historic environment.*

3.9 The appellant has submitted extensive evidence both as part of the Planning Statement and the additional Heritage Statement (Appendix E) to ensure the proposal does not cause substantial harm to the local character and significance of the associated heritage assets and the surrounding setting in which it is situated within.

Policy DMG1: General Considerations

- 3.10 The policy details the qualities of new developments that should result in planning permission being granted. The first section of the policy relates to design of development ensuring that the development is of a high standard of building design, sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size intensity and nature as well as scale, massing, style, features and building materials. Furthermore, the development should consider the density, layout, and relationship between building, placing particular emphasis on visual appearance and the impact on the landscape character.
- 3.11 The policy goes on to detail how the access should be considered in the development proposals, having considered the proportionate and potential impacts on traffic and car parking, to ensure safe ingress and egress for all users of the site.
- 3.12 This policy also requires the development to have no adverse effects on the surrounding amenities, including maintaining adequate day lighting and privacy distance, have regard to public safety, and consider and mitigate against any adverse impacts upon air quality.
- 3.13 With regards to the environment the policy details how proposals should consider the environmental implications including county heritage sites, special areas of conservation and special protected areas and protect heritage assets and their settings. The policy also sets out a sequential preference to which the council will consider the principle of the mitigation hierarchy that should be followed;
- 1) Enhance the environment*
 - 2) Avoid the impact*
 - 3) Minimise the impact*
 - 4) Restore the damage*
 - 5) Compensate for the damage*
 - 6) Offset the damage.*

- 3.14 Moreover, this policy states that development should *not prejudice future development which would provide significant environmental and amenity improvements.*

Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets

- 3.15 This policy assets that proposal that and in a conservation area or may affect the areas views are required to conserve and where appropriate enhance the character and appearance of the important features attributed to the area, considering the special and historic character identified within the conservation appraisal. A presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancements of these features will be applied and applications that do so through its location, scale, size design and materials and existing buildings, structures, trees and open spaces will be supported.

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

- 3.16 Section 66 of this act requires that in considering whether to grant planning permission or permission in principle for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
- 3.17 Section 72 of this act covers the Local Planning Authorities general duty in Conservation Areas and states;

72 General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions.

1. In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

2. Both section 66 and 72 of this Act identify the desirability of 'preserving' Conservation areas character and appearance, of which the previously submitted Heritage Statement (Appendix E) has demonstrated the scheme to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area by virtue of its complementary scale, design and materials.

South Lakeland District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment [1992] 1 PLR 143.

- 3.18 The above Case determined where neutral impact on a Conservation Area can be considered to 'preserve', in the consideration of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the Conservation Area and therefore can be considered appropriate development and would satisfy the statutory consideration.

Neutrality is acceptable

- 3.19 The judge in this case began with Section 72(1) of the Act, noting that in that section, "preserving" was used in conjunction with, but in contrast to, "enhancing", which itself imports the notion of positive improvement. They were alternatives. The judge noted that the section was not intended to limit development in a Conservation Area to that which enhanced its character or appearance. Its objective could also be achieved by a development that left its character or appearance unharmed. This established the principle that a development that was neutral in its effect upon a conservation area – in that it made no positive contribution to its preservation but left it unharmed – could properly be said to preserve the character and appearance of that area.
- 3.20 Subsequently, in regards to this proposal, the development can therefore be determined to preserve the Conservation Area by virtue of the fact of having no harm on, or significant enhancement to, the area.

Material Considerations

Conservation Area Appraisal

- 3.21 This document was adopted in 2006 and provides basis for which applications for development with the Gisburn Conservation Area can be assessed.
- 3.22 This document illustrates that the Vicarage has been identified to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. Whilst it is not a listed building it has been awarded Townscape Merit and such subject to advice provided in English Heritage guidance on conservation area character appraisals, and within Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 (PPG15) on the importance of protecting the building.
- 3.23 This document identified the following relating to the road network and parking weaknesses and subsequently negative features of the Gisburn Conservation area:
- constant presence of traffic passing through the village on the A59,
 - front gardens sacrificed to hard standing and car parking, especially on the south side of the Main Street

NPPF (2021)

- 3.24 The NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions as per Paragraph 2 of the Framework and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 3.25 Paragraph 128 in relation to design, states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. This statement has considered the design principles in detail, ensuring that the proposed development is compliant with the requirements of the Framework in contributing positively to making places better for people.
- 3.26 Paragraph 130 identified a set out requirements that planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure all developments feature including;

- a. will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
- b. are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;*
- c. are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);*
- d. establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;*
- e. optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and*
- f. create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.*

3.27 Paragraph 131 identifies trees told contribute to the character and quality of urban environments in addition to helping mitigate and adapt to climate change.

3.28 Paragraph 197 of the NPPF identifies how local planning authorities should determine applications within conservation areas including considering;

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.*

3.29 Paragraph 202 of the NPPF determines 'less substantial harm' to be weight against any public benefits of proposals including where appropriate securing its optimum viable use.

CASE FOR THE APPELLANT

Reasons for Refusal

4.1 One reason for refusal was included on the decision notice:

1. *The proposed garage and store is harmful to the character and appearance of Gisburn Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings because it is unduly prominent, incongruous, and conspicuous resulting from its size, form and siting. This is contrary to Key Statement EN5 and Policies DME4 and DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.*

Case for the Appellant

4.2 It is considered the scale and sitting of the proposed garage does not in fact result in the harm to the character and appearance of Gisburn Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings as stated in the reason for refusal.

4.3 In reference to the Committee Report included at Appendix A, the Case Officer assessed the proposed developments impact on the character and appearance of Gisburn Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings. The following was noted:

'The proposed garage is unduly prominent, incongruous and conspicuous because of its size, form (modern rooflights) and siting (front garden of the Vicarage; detached from the Vicarage's historic service buildings; land between the Vicarage and the church grounds; land between The Grove and the church grounds; adjacent to A682 and A59 - the view along the latter is an Important View in the conservation area appraisal). Important and intentional (as represented, for examples, by the neo-Tudor detailing of the vicarage with reference to the church and the orientation of The Grove facade) visual relationships between listed buildings and with the Vicarage are disrupted.'

Design

- 4.4 The appellant has considered the design of the proposed development to ensure a high-quality design is achieved which is fitting for the local context and does not detract from the street scene. This includes incorporating elements of the styles and materials of the existing Glebe Barn dwelling and being of similar size of other garages that support dwellings along Main Street, and that approved in 1989 for The Vicarage (3/1989/0811).
- 4.5 With regards to the size, form and sitting of the proposed development it has been evidenced that similar developments have been approved by the council within close proximity to site and therefore would not appear conspicuous but of a smaller scale and be used for the intended purpose of a garage as opposed to larger development for alternative residential uses that have been granted approval (Ref. 3/2019/0693). As such this development presents a proposal that puts the land within the Conservation Area 'to viable uses consistent with their conservation' thus, in compliance with Paragraph 197(a) of the NPPF the application should be determined favourably by Ribble Valley's planning authority.
- 4.6 The applicant would not be opposed to amending their design through imposing a condition requiring the rooflight to be obscure glazed, despite our view that the rooflight will have a limited impact. Indeed, the window would only be noticeable during the evenings if the appellant is in the garage with a light on, and we fail to see how such an occurrence would have a significant or detrimental impact.
- 4.7 The proposal accords with Policy DME4, with it being clear the appellant has had full regard for the schemes potential impact on the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings, providing a proposal that has incorporated the local characters instinctive style in their designs to overcome any harm to the conservation area and listed buildings.
- 4.8 As such, the proposal will not be notably detrimental, but will instead sit harmoniously between Glebe Barn, The Vicarage, and the Church grounds through matching the

materials to those that are prevalent within the surrounds. This proposal also presents development that will make appropriate and efficient use of the land available at the site and will evidently fit into its surrounding context sufficing Principle 3 and 4 of the Building in Context Principles.

- 4.9 Paragraph 128 of the NPPF and the Gisburn Conservation Area Appraisal have both identified development should be allowed to have a suitable degree of variety, reflective of the area given that the Gisburn Conservation Area Appraisal identified there to be no one property type that dominates and there to be 'is a pleasing mix of small-scale two-up, two-down cottages built in rows, larger double pile detached houses with symmetrical front elevations, and coaching inns or public houses, each with its own individual style'. Thus, highlighting how minor disparities in the design will not appear incongruous or negatively impact the area.
- 4.10 Moreover, the proposed sitting of the garage utilises and incorporates existing trees and hedgerows as a way to improve the design and support the sitting of the proposal within the existing development pattern. The sitting of the garage therefore protects the retention of the front gardens, hedges and trees identified within the Gisburn Conservation Area Appraisal to commonly be sacrificed for car parking as a significant weakness of the area and identified within Paragraph 131 of the NPPF to be an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments thus supports the conservation of the areas character.
- 4.11 There are no issues on the impact upon the character and appearance of Gisburn Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings. Therefore, it is in compliance with current planning and design guidance presenting a development of a design that paragraph 130 of the NPPF abides to for a positive planning decision to be made, having been designed to integrate well within the surrounds through the use of similar materials in accordance with Principle 1 and 2 of the Building in Context Principles.

Heritage

- 4.12 The appellant provided a detailed and robust Heritage Statement (Appendix E) which accompanied the initial submission. The submitted Heritage Statement demonstrates how the design has been meticulously designed to ensure there is minimal adverse impact upon the Vicarage, and the Gisburn Conservation Area as a whole, through following the guidance contained within the Gisburn Conservation Area management guidance in designing the new development.
- 4.13 The importance of the view of the land between The Grove and Church grounds adjacent to the A682 and A59 has been considered in the development of this proposal and accepted within the Heritage statement to be visible in some views of listed buildings and the road. However, the visual impact will not be detrimental or harmful to the existing buildings. In fact, the proposal will improve the views, removing the siting of parked cars upon hardstanding, through the erection of a small garage that will be of similar design of the adjacent Glebe Barn.
- 4.14 It is also important to recognise that the proposal will reduce the number of parked cars that currently form a visual and safety disruption to Main Street and support the provision of parking spaces required for the adjacent local restaurant. This is important attribution to the road safety as recognised within the Gisburn Conservation Area Appraisal problematic given that there is a constant presence of traffic passing through the village and would present a proposal offering substantial public benefits with a less substantial harm to the conservation area as a requirement to be considered within the NPPF (Paragraph 202).
- 4.15 Paragraph 197(b, c) further presents the development to be determined favourably given that it presents a positive contribution when considering how it will form a sustainable community and positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness reflecting a rise in the prominence of car ownership.

- 4.16 The application is additionally supported by a Heritage Statement which demonstrates that the proposal will have no harmful impact on the historic environment. In addition, the previously identified Case Law, *South Lakeland District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment* [1992] 1 PLR 143, illustrated that preservation could be established 'even if it was altered by development, if the character or appearance (its significance in other words) was not harmed.' Therefore, any deviation from the current street scene views is considered to be acceptable by virtue of the proposal having a neutral impact.
- 4.17 Whilst considered by the Case officer within their Officer's Report that the scheme caused 'less than substantial harm', identifying NPPF paragraph 196 (202 as of the 2021 revised NPPF) that require that 'less than substantial' harm be weighed against any public benefits of proposals', it is considered that as the impact or harm on the setting of the listed building (and the Conservation Area) of this proposal is negligible or benign, consideration against Paragraph 202 of the NPPF is not required.
- 4.18 As set out in the submitted Heritage Statement, and again referred to in the Planning Statement, as the impact of the proposal is negligible or benign, the scheme should be supported by the high weighted Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 72 (by virtue of it preserving) and the example set out within the Case Law previously identified on the basis that preservation could be established 'even if it was altered by development, if the character or appearance (its significance in other words) was not harmed.'
- 4.19 The design and landscape of the design substantially incorporates existing trees and hedgerows as a way to improve the design and support the sitting of the proposal within the existing development pattern. As such, the visual impact is further reduced given that the proposal is of small-scale, low height peripheral, partially obscured by trees and shrubs and constructed of materials to create a harmonious feature. The garage has evidently been carefully designed to minimise its overall visual impact.
- 4.20 The proposed development has not received any objections or issues from the statutory consultees nor the local residents, suggesting the existing properties and environmental

would be harmed by the development. A planning condition was proposed to retain the Hawthorn tree on site of which the applicant is happy to comply with.

Conclusions

- 4.21 The evidence presented in this appeal statement demonstrates how the proposed development is in full accordance with the development plan and has overcome any concerns raised in the reason for refusal.
- 4.22 In terms of the reason for refusal, this statement has highlighted there to be no objections from either statutory or residents regarding to the undue loss of privacy demonstrating the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings can be preserved through the development in accordance with Policy DMG1; Policy DME4; and Section 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

15 CONCLUSION

- 5.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 5.2 The evidence presented demonstrates how the proposed development should have not been refused for the identified reason for refusal. Significant work has been undertaken to demonstrate how the proposals are acceptable in terms of impact on the surrounding character and appearance with the siting, design, scale, and landscaping associated with the dwelling ensuring impact is minimised.
- 5.3 It should also be emphasised the scheme will bring the following benefits:
- The proposed development would improve the visual quality of the area through the reduction of parked cars along.
 - The proposals would reduce on street parking which at present is an issue within the area, subsequently creating a safer and less congested road network.
 - The proposal will provide a safe place for the applicant to secure their cars off the main road.
 - The proposal is supported by Paragraph 8 of the NPPF sets out that there are three objectives to sustainable development: economic, social, and environmental. The site is situated in a sustainable location in the centre of Gisburn close to services and amenities. The site forms part of the residential curtilage of Glebe Barn.
 - There is similar developments along the street demonstrating the proposed use and scale of the development to be in keeping with the surrounding area.
 - Finally, the proposal is of small scale, low height peripheral, partially obscured by trees and shrubs which would be capable of screening the development sufficiently to minimise any visual impact. The garage design, scale and sitting have also been carefully considered to nestle within the existing landscape and minimise any potential impact on the landscape character of the area.

- 5.4 As there is no significant or demonstrable harm arising from the proposed development that could outweigh the very clear benefits, the appeal should be allowed in accordance with presumption in favour of sustainable economic development as set out in the NPPF and relevant local policy in the adopted local plan. and that the preservation of the Conservation Area in this case is supported by the high weighted Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 72, and the Case Law previously identified.
- 5.5 As such, it is maintained that the Council's reason for refusal is not justified, and the inspector is respectfully requested to allow this appeal and grant planning permission.



www.pwaplanning.co.uk

2 Lockside Office Park
Lockside Road
Preston
PR2 2YS

01772 369 669
info@pwaplanning.co.uk
www.pwaplanning.co.uk