

Halsteads Farm, Rimington Lane, Rimington BB7 4EA

Planning permission and LBC for proposed alterations including single-storey extension to side and remodelling of garden terrace area.

WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS - APPEAL STATEMENT

May 2024



REPORT CONTROL

Document type	Written Appeal Statement
Project	Halsteads Farm, Rimington Lane
Client	Rob Hargrove
Job Number	24-1783

Document Checking

Primary Author	Gabriela de Amorim
Contributor	Paige Linley
Reviewer	Joshua Hellawell

Revision Status

Issue	Date
Draft	17/04/2024
Final	30/04/2024



CONTENTS

- 1 INTRODUCTION**
- 2 APPEAL CONTEXT**
- 3 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**
- 4 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY**
- 5 CASE FOR THE APPELLANT**
- 6 CONCLUSION**

Appendices

Appendix A – Decision Notice (3/2023/1049)

Appendix B – Decision Notice (3/2023/1050)

Appendix C – Delegated Officer Reports

Appendix D - Heritage Statement



/1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. PWA Planning is retained by Mr Rob Hargrove ('the appellant') to lodge an appeal against the refusal of listed building consent ('LBC') application ref. 3/2023/1049 and planning application ref. 3/2023/1050 relating to the proposed alterations including single-storey extension to side and remodelling of garden terrace at Halsteads Farm, Rimington Lane, Rimington, BB7 4EA.
- 1.2. The applications were submitted to Ribble Valley Borough Council (the Council) on the 22nd December 2023 and were accompanied by a full suite of plans and supporting information including a Design and Access Statement and Heritage Statement. The applications were both subsequently refused on 15th February 2024. The LBC application had one reason for refusal (RfR), as follows:

'The proposed extension, by virtue of its footprint, subsequent loss of original plan form, width, orientation, flat roof profile, fenestration and use of modern materials would have a harmful impact upon the Grade II Listed Building Halsteads Farm. As such, the proposal fails to meet the requirements of Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Paragraphs 205 and 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework.'

- 1.3. The householder application had one reason for refusal, which is similar to the wording of the RfR associated with the householder application, however, is worded slightly differently, as set out below:

'The proposed extension, by virtue of its footprint, width, orientation, flat roof profile, fenestration and use of modern materials would have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the application property, a Grade II Listed Building. As such, the proposal would fail to meet the requirements of Key Statement EN5 and Policies DME4 and DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy, Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Paragraphs 135 (c), 205 and 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework.'



- 1.4. This appeal statement, made under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, has been prepared against the refusals. The decision notices for both applications are enclosed at Appendix A and B, with the respective Officer Reports contained in Appendix C.

- 1.5. In terms of the aforementioned reasons for refusal, the appellant contests that the proposed development would cause harm to the character of Halsteads Farm that would warrant refusal of the applications. This appeal statement seeks to demonstrate that the development represents appropriate development and should have therefore been approved.



/2 APPEAL CONTEXT

- 2.1. The merits of this development have already been considered by the LPA as part of both the LBC application and householder application that were refused on 15th February 2024 (application ref: 3/2023/1049 and 3/2023/1050). The relevant documents associated with both applications are submitted with the appeals. Nonetheless, a summary of the site and surrounding area is provided below.
- 2.2. The appeal site, which measures approximately 0.2ha, is located at Halsteads Farm accessed to the south east of Rimington Lane. Halsteads Farm comprises of the Grade II Listed Halstead Farmhouse, to which this appeal relates and an associated detached garage, garden and courtyard to the south and east of the site. An aerial image of the site in the context of its immediate surroundings is shown below at Figure 1.



Figure 1: Aerial Image showing the location of the site (not to scale)

- 2.3. The site is situated in a rural area, surrounded by agricultural land with the nearest settlement being the village of Rimington, which is approximately 300m from the site. There are properties to the immediate northeast and to the southwest of the site. The main road used to access the site is Rimington Lane, which connects to the A59.
- 2.4. There are no ecological constraints associated with the site itself. The site is not within an area identified by the Environment Agency's flood risk map as being subject to flooding; located wholly within Flood Zone 1. With regards to heritage constraints, apart from Halstead Farmhouse itself, there are no other heritage assets within the site's immediate vicinity.



Planning History

2.5. A search of Ribble Valley Borough Council's online planning register has been carried out in order to understand the planning history relevant to the site.

2.6. The following applications have been identified on the site and are relevant to this appeal:

- Application 3/2023/1050: Planning Permission for proposed alterations including single-storey extension to side and remodelling of garden terrace area. Refused, 15th February 2024.
- Application 3/2023/1049: Listed Building Consent for proposed alterations including single-storey extension to side and remodelling of garden terrace area. Refused, 15th February 2024.
- Application 3/2008/0667: Demolition of agricultural buildings and construction of two holiday cottages. Construction of detached garage. Appeal allowed, 9th July 2009.

2.7. As mentioned in Section 1, this appeal relates to both the LBC application and householder application (3/2023/1049 and 3/2023/1050) which were refused on the basis that the extension was considered to have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the Listed Building. The extension was regarded by the Council as being too large and that the use of modern materials would negatively impact the character of Halstead Farmhouse. Further detail on why the proposed works are considered acceptable are dealt with further within this statement.



/3 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

3.1. The proposal comprises alterations which include a single storey extension to the side and the remodelling of the garden terrace area. The key thrust behind the design of the proposed alterations is to be respectful to the listed asset whilst taking into consideration more modern interventions that have taken place over recent years. The scheme also seeks to return the character of the property and associated garden area closer to their original arrangement and appearance both externally and internally. The Appellant has recently purchased the property and therefore is seeking to revert the general character of the building back to a more traditional style, with an extension to allow for additional living accommodation for them and their family to utilise.

The Farmhouse

3.2. Alterations to the Listed Farmhouse will be minimal. The original ground floor room configuration with 'double pile' rooms described in the listing statement will be reintroduced. The main entrance doorway will be re-established. The proposed works will have little or no effect on existing elevations and window/door openings.

The 'Barn'

3.3. This section is located east of the Farmhouse and has been converted from a barn to be incorporated as additional living accommodation as part of the main dwelling. The previous conversion work removed much of the barn's original character. The proposals seek to restore the barn's character and perceived internal volume, which includes the elimination of the second staircase, mezzanine level and office space. The proposed works will have little or no effect on existing elevations and window/door openings. Existing rooflights will be replaced with conservation style rooflights. All of these elements are considered to be benefits to the scheme.

The Extension

3.4. The proposed extension seeks to relieve pressure on the farmhouse and 'barn', allowing for the reinstatement works. A frameless glass link enables the extension to 'touch' the farmhouse as gently as possible. The existing window opening to the farmhouse's rendered



gable will be converted into an entryway for the addition. The extension is single-storey with a 'green' roof, keeping the overall height of the extension to a minimum so as to appear subservient when taken in context of the farmhouse and barn. The extension's design and configuration, together with its position behind the existing hedge/trees, will make it nearly inconspicuous, when viewed from Rimington Lane.

3.5. The appearance of the farmhouse and integral 'barn' will be largely unaffected by the works. The contemporary treatment of the extension is respectful of the farmhouse whilst ensuring that 'old' and 'new' can be clearly understood and so to ensure the extension appears subservient to the existing built form on site. The extension will be finished in local natural stone to match the farmhouse. The 'green' roof ensures that the overall height is kept to a minimum, reducing any visual impacts of the proposed extension from further views, whilst also providing an ecological habitat increasing the biodiversity value of the site.

3.6. As mentioned in Section 2, the applications were refused on the basis that the Council considered that the proposed extension would be too large of an addition to the site, whilst also being comprised of modern materials that would not be in keeping with the character of the Listed Building.

3.7. Regarding materials, the extension will have stone walling that will match the visual characteristics of the converted barn and the lane facing elevation. The glazed link between the listed building and the extension will provide a visual and material separation that will also allow views of the original gable from the exterior. Whilst glazing is proposed, this is largely proposed to the south east elevation of the extension and therefore is not visible from public vantage points.

3.8. The detailed design rationale is set out within the supporting Design Statement submitted with both applications and supporting the appeals. Further assessment on the acceptability of the proposals have been dealt with at Section 5.



/4 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

- 4.1 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.
- 4.2 The Development Plan for the appeal site comprises the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008-2028 (2014). Key policy documents that comprise 'material considerations' include the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG), and any local supplementary planning guidance documents and decisions considered relevant to the proposal.
- 4.3 The following policies are considered to be of relevance to the proposals and are also referenced by the Council within the Decision Notices and RfRs.

Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008-2028 (Adopted 2014)

- 4.4 **Key Statement EN5: Heritage Assets** – this policy relates to developments affecting heritage assets. It states that developments should not cause substantial harm to a heritage asset and should conserve and enhance their significance.
- 4.5 **Policy DME4: Protecting Heritage Assets** – sets out that developments should preserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings. Point 2 relates specifically to listed buildings and states that extensions to listed buildings should not cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset.
- 4.6 **Policy DMG1: General Considerations** – sets out a general overview of what is expected from proposals in relation to design, access, amenity, environment, infrastructure and others.
- 4.7 Within the Decision Notices, the Council refer to the following material considerations.

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

- 4.8 This legislation specifically relates to developments affecting listed buildings. The Decision Notice references Section 16 which is set out below and of relevance to the appeals.



4.9 Section 16 relates to decisions on applications relating to listed buildings:

Decision on application.

- 1) *Subject to the previous provisions of this Part, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State may grant or refuse an application for listed building consent and, if they grant consent, may grant it subject to conditions.*
- 2) *In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority or 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) *Any listed building consent shall (except in so far as it otherwise provides) ensure for the benefit of the building and of all persons for the time being interested in it.*

4.10 Additionally, Section 66 is also of relevance and was referred to in the decision notices. Section 66 states that:

General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions.

- 1) *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.*
- 2) *Without prejudice to section 72, in the exercise of the powers of appropriation, disposal and development (including redevelopment) conferred by the provisions of sections 232, 233 and 235(1) of the principal Act, a local authority shall have regard to the desirability of preserving features of special architectural or historic interest, and in particular, listed buildings.*
- 3) *The reference in subsection (2) to a local authority includes a reference to a joint planning board.*

National Planning Policy Framework

4.11 The following paragraphs of the NPPF are also considered of key relevance to the proposals:



4.12 **Paragraph 135** ensure that developments:

- 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.*

4.13 **Paragraph 205** states that great weight should be given to the assets conservation when considering the impact of a proposed development on a heritage asset. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

4.14 **Paragraph 208** states that where the development will lead to less than substantial harm to the heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.



/5 CASE FOR THE APPELLANT

Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The reasons for refusal were included on the decision notices as included at Appendix 1 and 2 and set out at 1.2 and 1.3 of this appeal statement. Whilst each reason for refusal was worded slightly differently, the general reasoning behind the reasons for refusal on both the householder application and the LBC were largely the same. Therefore, both matters have been considered as one below, with relevance drawn to each individual application where relevant.

Case for the Appellant

Heritage

5.2 The Appellant has recently acquired the site and is seeking to make amendments to the property which include limited alterations to the farmhouse and barn, with an extension to provide additional living accommodation. The scheme also incorporates works to the garden including the remodelling of the terraced area.

5.3 Halstead Farmhouse is a Grade II Listed property dating back to the 18th century. As set out in the supporting Heritage Statement (Appendix D), the original farmhouse at Halsteads Farm is an altered two storey twin-bay and double-pile house with coursed watershot stone walling to the front (south facing) with rendered and rubble stone walls to the sides and rear. It has a gabled slated roof with gable stacks. In the 1980s, the former barn was incorporated into the farmhouse to function as additional living accommodation, and at this time it is thought that further alterations were undertaken internally, modernising the overall appearance of the property. A further detached garage was constructed also in the 20th century. Photographs and historical mapping of the property are also included within the supporting heritage statement.

5.4 The applications were refused on the basis that the extensions footprint, width, orientation, flat roof profile, fenestration and use of modern materials would have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the Grade II Listed Building. Therefore, the key matters of relevance to the appeals relate to heritage impacts upon Halstead Farm. It is understood that the Council do not contest that the principle of an extension, or alterations to the property



are not acceptable, simply that the scheme presented to them is not in their opinion, sympathetic to the heritage asset, therefore resulting in refusal of the application.

- 5.5 The Officer Reports (Appendix C) state that the proposed alterations to the interior of the farmhouse and the adjoining barn would be acceptable given that the changes seek to reverse more modern changes which deviate from the original planform and layout of the dwelling. It is also noted that the proposed conservation rooflights were considered by the Council to provide a 'minor visual enhancement' and therefore this element has been perceived as a benefit, which we would agree with. It is therefore understood that the key point of contention between the Appellant and the LPA relates to the proposed extension which is discussed further below.
- 5.6 Both Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4 state that there will be a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of the significance of heritage assets and their settings. The proposal involves multiple elements which seek to improve the character of the building, reversing more modern interventions which do not respond well to the listed asset and its historical significance.
- 5.7 It is our view that not enough emphasis has been placed on the benefits that would be sought through the proposed alterations. The Officer states that '*construction of the proposed extension would offer limited small scale public benefits in the form of short term contractor employment. Construction of the proposed extension and the additional minor internal alterations proposed would otherwise be utilised for private use with the only benefactors being the residents of Halsteads Farm. As such, the limited public benefits identified are not considered to outweigh the harm that would occur to the heritage asset from the proposed development in this instance*'. There is no specific reference to the alterations providing benefits that would reverse more modern interventions, allowing for the property to be largely reinstated to its original planform and layout, which we consider to be of particular relevance. Whilst this will only be seen internally, it remains an important benefit to the scheme, given that the internal arrangements of listed properties should be conserved and enhanced, which this scheme seeks to do. There are also other external amendments, of key relevance is the proposed conservation roof lights, which will again provide benefits over and above the existing position which will be much more sympathetic to the listed building.



5.8 It is our view that these matters should have been assessed in more detail in the planning balance, with more weight attributed to the benefits they would provide given that the Appellant is under no obligation to implement these elements, and without the proposed extension coming forward is unlikely to make the alterations. On that basis, the scheme is considered to represent important benefits that would seek to revert the property back more in line with its original appearance and therefore, provides enhancements to the property in its current position, complying with Key Statement EN5 and Policy DME4.

5.9 With respect to the extension itself, our heritage consultant stated in their report that in respect of the position of the extension it is contextually appropriate for a listed building, with the main façade of the extension facing away from the lane towards to the southeast. Moreover, it occupies unused space without necessitating major alterations or new access routes, which would in turn result in their own issues in respect of heritage impacts. Strategic landscaping ensures partial obscuring of views from the lane, minimising visual impact. Additionally, in terms of visual impact, the extension's scale, predominantly glazed façade, and material contrast respect the primacy of the listed building. The proposed materials will be comparable to the existing property which will ensure a harmonious development of high quality. Whilst glazing will be utilised to the rear, this is focussed on the elevation that is not visible from public vantage points. The partial screening of the extension by trees and shrubs as viewed from the lane will also minimise visual change from this public realm space.

5.10 The extension has been carefully designed to ensure it is set lower than the listed building and is much smaller in terms of its overall footprint. The listed building retains its dominant position and elevated status, as is further ensured by the lightweight and transparent nature of the extensions glazed elements, ensuring that the focus remains on the heritage asset, particularly when viewed from public vantage points. As the extension has been focussed to the rear of the property, with a fairly minimalistic design on the northwest elevation which faces the roadside, the extension is unlikely to be noticeable from the wider context. People travelling down Rimington Lane from either direction will likely see the main property first due to its height and the positioning of the extension and glass link, meaning that it could be taken to appear as an outbuilding or an agricultural building. Together these design features will ensure the subservience of the extension.

5.11 It should also be noted that the scheme has been quite significantly revised since the initial pre-application discussions to respond to comments made by the Local Authority. The



scheme was revised to follow the orientation and linear arrangement to Halsteads Farm, which was also assessed as an appropriate feature by the Heritage Consultant to retain the planform of the building, despite Officers assertions that the proposed extension has no historic reference to the building's original planform. The overall scale and width has also been reduced, whilst being retained as large enough so as to allow useable living space for the Appellant and their family. The scheme has been reduced to only an 8.5% increase in the overall floor area, and a 19% increase in volume which is considered to be appropriate for an extension on a plot of this size. In addition, the height of the extension was reduced, making it approximately 4200mm lower than the ridge of the main house and 2850mm lower than the ridge of the barn. The flat roof profile of the proposal helps to achieve these lower heights whilst also retaining useable space within the extension to allow it to serve its purpose for the occupiers. Other amendments have been made including the omission of a rooflight and additional planting for screening purposes, full details are included on the submitted plans and Design and Access Statement.

- 5.12 As suggested by the Appellant's heritage consultant and also highlighted by officers, the significance of Halsteads Farm as a heritage asset is largely underpinned by its historic interest (evidence of historic rural lifestyles) and architectural interest (mullioned windows, symmetrical South-eastern façade, plaque with inscription). The historic interest in the property due to its evidence of historic rural lifestyles will be retained in the proposed development, given that the existing farmhouse and associated barn will be retained largely as per their existing position and where they are to be altered, will be done in a fashion to reverse more modern interventions, resulting in an overall benefit to the historic significance of the property. The property will remain representative of typical historic rural architecture, with the more contemporary addition, screened and unlikely to be visible from passers-by. With respect to the architectural interest of the property, the mullioned windows, symmetrical south-eastern façade and plaque with inscription will all be retained as part of the proposals and therefore the key elements of significance when considering the property as a heritage asset will be retained, which is considered to be of key importance to the proposals.
- 5.13 It was concluded by the Appellant's heritage consultant that the likely impact of the scheme upon the heritage significances of the listed building will be benign in nature. He goes on to state that the reason for this conclusion is the positive impacts of the interior alterations, the subservient nature of the extension which harmonises the use of materials and the contrasting nature of design which is both visually interesting and readily interpretable. It is



also important to note that the Council did not consult with a qualified heritage officer on this application and instead, conclusions with respect to heritage impacts were made by planning officers. Whilst we appreciate that design and heritage impacts are regularly dealt with by planning officers, when considering such a subjective impact, it is our view that the qualified heritage consultant should be the one relied upon. The heritage statement submitted with the application was prepared by a qualified heritage consultant and as such, should be given greater weight than views of the planning officer, in the absence of any qualified heritage officer/consultant comments from the Local Authorities perspective.

Design

5.14 From a review of the Officer's Report, it is understood that the following elements are considered acceptable from a design perspective:

- Remodelling of garden patio area including creation of new hardstanding
- Replacement of three standard rooflights with three conservation rooflights
- Reconfiguration of the entry to the barn including a replacement doorway and windows.

5.15 Officers suggested that the proposed footprint of the extension would be significant and comparable in terms of size to the floorspace area occupied by the farmhouse component of the application property. To ensure that minimal height is achieved and also so that it appears subservient to the main part of the dwelling, the extension has been proposed as single storey. To ensure a sufficient level of space is available to make the extension worth constructing, the scheme results in an 8.5% increase in floor area and 19% increase in volume, making it a reasonable extension that would be expected to come forward on residential properties, particularly on a plot of this size. When compared to the remainder of the property, the extension would not result in an unreasonable increase in additional floor area.

5.16 The Officer also raised issue with the proposed width of the extension due to this projecting forward of the 'principal' elevation. The principal elevation cannot be seen from any views other than within the site itself, therefore any design impacts are limited. Whilst the extension will project forward of the property, this will be limited to the south west of the site which will not be immediately visible when entering the property, where the main farmhouse and



converted barn will be viewed first with the extension read as an addition afterwards. It is not considered that the limited project forward of the principal extension would cause sufficient harm to warrant refusal of the application, given the design of the extension has been carefully designed so as to still appear as subservient to the main dwelling.

5.17 In terms of the materials, Officers stated that 'the extension's glazed link element, flat sedum roof profile, full length glazed panels and aluminium framework would all read as highly incongruous in the context of the traditional stonework, slated gable roof profile and attractive mullioned window features of the host property'. It is important to note that the proposed extension has been designed intentionally to ensure that the extension is not read as a pastiche addition to the property, but clearly differentiates that this is a modern intervention, which seeks to still respect the character of the main dwelling. Glazing and aluminium are often used as materials where more historic traditional buildings are extended, where the design is intended to ensure a clear separation between the two elements, whilst ensuring one cohesive well designed property. The flat sedum roof will also provide landscaping and biodiversity benefits, whilst keeping the height of the extension as low as possible but retaining useable family space.

5.18 The scheme has been carefully designed by qualified and experienced architects, who have worked on many other schemes for Listed Buildings across the country and more specifically, within the Ribble Valley. As set out in the Design and Access Statement, the proposals have been prepared following the detailed consideration or the pre-application advice received from the Council. The design is sympathetic and respectful to the existing house and its setting. The 3D study shows that the visual impact will be minimal. The area and volume assessments comparing the proposals to both the existing house and across the whole site demonstrate only a minimal change. Materials and detailing are respectful and sympathetic to and respond to Halsteads Farm and the village of Rimington.

Summary

5.19 The proposed works have been shown to be, in many aspects, acceptable to the Council. Where the development hasn't be adjudged as acceptable (the side extension) it is asserted the Officer's Reports associated with both applications have overstated the impacts and have not given sufficient regard to conclusions of the Heritage Statement.



- 5.20 The reports fail to appreciate that the use of more modern materials in places is a design concept used to ensure the proposed works maintain the visual prominence of the listed building. They provide a contrast to the architectural styling, signifying a new chapter in the property's life as opposed to appearing as a pastiche and piece meal add on. Notwithstanding that the design retains stone as the principal construction material which in ensures that whilst contrasting from the main listed structure, it maintains its primacy and is clearly subservient.
- 5.21 On this basis proposal is considered compliant with Key Statement EN5 and Polices DME4 and DMG1, given it represents a level of design and conservation that is commendable and acceptable in its impacts.
- 5.22 Should the Inspector not be minded to agree with the above, it is the Appellant's position that more weight should be afforded to the public benefits of the scheme which namely relate to the restoration of the original floorplan and the opening up of the barn to its full height. In this regard the accompanying heritage assessment refers to this as very positive alterations which "*enhance the heritage significance of the listed building*".
- 5.23 Hence, whilst it is the Appellant's position that any impacts are acceptable and positive, in an instance where this is not considered to be the case, determinative weight should still be afforded to the public benefits for the submission.



/6 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 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.
- 6.2 The evidence presented as part of the appeals demonstrate that the proposed development should be supported. With regard to the reason for refusal, the scheme proposes a sympathetic extension to the existing dwelling, which seeks to continue the linear planform and expansion of the farmhouse and converted barn. The proposed extension has been designed carefully with heritage principles in mind, and revisions made to the scheme following pre-application discussions with the LPA. The scheme respects the architectural and historic significances of the listed building and responds to the context of the site.
- 6.3 The proposed amendments to the main house, which involve reinstating the original floor plan of the house and opening up a full height space in the former barn, are wholly positive changes which enhance the heritage significance of the listed building and should therefore be attributed significant weight in the consideration of the planning balance.
- 6.4 A qualified heritage consultant has been instructed on behalf of the Appellant who concluded that '*the likely impact of the scheme upon the heritage significances of the listed building has been assessed, including the very positive alterations within the listed building and the impact upon setting brought about by the extension. The overall findings are that the impact of the proposals will be benign in nature. This is due to the positive impacts of the interior alterations, the subservient nature of the extension, the extension's continuation of the linear expansion of plan form, the harmonising use of materials and the contrasting nature of design, which is both visually interesting and readily interpretable. When and if completed, the extension will not challenge or negatively impact upon the heritage significances of the listed farmhouse, but will instead present a new chapter in the history Halsteads Farm with a contemporary addition that has been designed with the specifics of context in mind.*'
- 6.5 On that basis, it is our view that the scheme as submitted is acceptable as there are clear benefits proposed to the listed building that outweigh any limited harm. The planning balance is weighed heavily in favour of the proposed development. As such, the Inspector is respectfully requested to allow the appeals and grant planning permission and LBC.



2 Lockside Office Park
Lockside Road
Preston
PR2 2YS

01772 369 669

www.pwaplanning.co.uk

