

This report needs to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

DATE INSPECTED:

TELEPHONE CALLS: YES / NO

DATE:

Ribble Valley Borough Council

DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT - REFUSAL

Ref: AD/EL

Application No:	3/2015/0517/P (PA)
Development Proposed:	Single storey extension to rear and extension of curtilage to create a walled back garden at Wolfen Hall, Fish House Lane, Chipping

CONSULTATIONS: Parish/Town Council

Parish Council - No comments received.

CONSULTATIONS: Highway/Water Authority/Other Bodies

RVBC Countryside Officer – Need a building dependent protected species survey (bats). As to wider ecological considerations – extension within amenity grassland/semi-improved grassland but no statutory notices affecting in the immediate vicinity. Footpath No 12 runs in a north east/south west direction to the south east of the Hall and so the expanse of grass would be seen from this footpath.

CONSULTATIONS: Additional Representations

No representations have been received.

RELEVANT POLICIES:

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

NPPF

NPPG

HEPPG (under revision)

Policy DMG1 – General Considerations

Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets

Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations

Policy DME2 – Landscape and Townscape Protection

Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation

Policy DMH5 – Residential and Curtilage Extensions

POLICY REASONS FOR REFUSAL:

Harmful to listed building and cultural heritage of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty because: extension is prominent, visually conspicuous and unsympathetic to vernacular and agricultural character and the walling is prominent and encloses an important and historically open area of the farmstead. Core Strategy Policies DME4, DMG1, DMG2 and DMH5 and NPPF Paragraph 17, 115, 131 and 132.

COMMENTS/ENVIRONMENTAL/AONB/HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES/RECOMMENDATION:

Wolfen Hall is a Grade II listed (22 November 1983) house, possibly 16th century, altered 1867-1868. The list description suggests the core of the building to be the two bay two storey element with early and very interesting fabric. There is a later parallel range to the rear and a 19th century extension to the right. Further to the right, and maintaining the vernacular linearity of the farmstead (see pages 45 and 47 of English Heritage's 'Historic Farmsteads, Preliminary Character Statement: North West Region', 2006), is a collection of traditional

stone farm buildings (including the 'Keepers Cottage' conversion). The 1845 Ordnance Survey Map shows that there have been changes to the building footprint but the overall historic farmstead plan and layout has been retained. There is strong inter-visibility between buildings on this site.

Whilst the farmstead is isolated within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty it is prominent in public views (particularly from Parlick and Wolf Fell which overshadow the site; public rights of way include the footpaths which pass immediately to the south of the Hall and steading).

The site is very close to a SSSI.

Relevant planning history

Pre-application advice on the proposed works provided 15 January 2015. This identifies:

"I have considered the information (Louise Gill; Stephen Haigh) submitted as part of the recent appeal (front porch) in assessment of the significance and special interest of the listed building. The special interest of the listed building lies primarily in its surviving Mediaeval interior features. The Heritage Statements identify that building facades are largely the product of 19th century and later rebuilds and re-modellings and Stephen Haigh opines that the farmhouse is undistinguishable from houses of the mid 1860's in this respect (paragraph 4.1). I also note with reference to current proposals that Stephen Haigh considers the existing front elevation "small walled garden to the early part of the house" to be a dominant feature of the immediate setting of the listed building (paragraph 4.3).

The historic map regressions, list description and the Heritage Statements suggest that interest may be retained in the distinctive single range planform of the farmhouse/farmstead and curtilage definition.

... I am therefore concerned that the proposed extension (a new wing with a large expanse of glazing and roof lights) and the proposed walled enclosure do not safeguard the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. The existing dominance of the single range and lack of containment of the rear elevation appear to be important elements of the significance of the listed building and its contribution to the character of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The proximity of trees to the proposed development site is noted".

3/2014/0746 - New porch to front elevation linked to 3/2013/0578/P. PP granted 7 November 2014.

3/2013/0578/P (LBC) & 3/2013/0579/P (PA) – New porch to front elevation. LBC and PP refused 9 August 2013. No pre-application advice was sought in respect of the proposals. LBC was granted on appeal 21 July 2014.

The Planning Inspector considered:

"The proposed 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 ... The current and original form of the house would remain clearly apparent ... The door in the original part of the house is clearly the main door and, in this regard, the porch would be to a secondary door and would elevate its significance. But this reflects the evolving internal layout of the house and is not a significant factor ... The significant depth of the proposed porch ... The plain character of the house would be enhanced by the proposed addition". The Planning Inspector did not comment on the relative significance of building exterior and interior.

3/1999/0188 – EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS. PP granted 10 June 1999.

3/1999/0189 – EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS. LBC granted 10 June 1999.

3/1999/ 0832 – EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS. PP granted 13 January 2000.

3/1999/0833 – EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS. LBC granted 13 January 2000.

3/1995/0487 - TAKE DOWN GABLE WALL AND REBUILD AS EXISTING INCLUDING REBUILDING CHIMNEY AND INCORPORATE 3 No. NEW WINDOWS. LBC granted 11 September 1995.

An extensive site history relates to the farm stead outbuildings.

Legislation, policy, guidance and information

Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that when considering applications for listed building consent, special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the 'General duty as respects listed buildings in exercise of planning functions', states that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development that affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority 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.

The Governance and Legal Director of English Heritage ('Legal Developments: The Big Issue of Little Harm' Conservation Bulletin Issue 73: Winter 2014) states in respect to (any level of) harm to a listed building:

*"The Lyveden case reaffirmed that this means the conservation of a listed building should be afforded 'considerable weight and importance' ... with the 'great weight' of paragraph 132 and you should appreciate that minor harm does not mean merely a minor concern ... **Any harm is to be given 'great weight' whether it is serious, substantial, moderate, minor or less than substantial ... every decision should acknowledge the general priority afforded to heritage conservation in comparison to other planning objectives or public benefits ... Minor harm to a heritage asset can add up to major and irreversible damage. It is obviously right that planning decisions reflect on this threat each and every time**".*

In respect to the Lyveden Court of Appeal decision, Gordon Nardell QC and Justine Thornton ('Turbines, heritage assets and merits', Local Government Lawyer, 24 April 2014) state:

"the key point is that once a decision-maker finds harm (to setting), there must be some express acknowledgement of the 'considerable' weight to be given, in the balance, to the desirability of avoiding that harm. It is not enough to ask in a general sense whether benefits outweigh harm, but whether they do so sufficiently to rebut the strong presumption against permission".

Consideration of 'less than substantial harm' is made in the Secretary of State's decision on Lane Head Farm, Cumbria (recovered appeal; decision 16 April 2014; paragraph 11) and Bythorn and Molesworth, Cambridgeshire (recovered appeal; decision 3 December 2014; paragraph 29): *"having regard to the judgment in the Barnwell Manor case, the Secretary of State takes the view that it does not follow that if the harm to heritage assets is found to be less than substantial, then the subsequent balancing exercise undertaken by the decision*

taker should ignore the overarching statutory duty imposed by section 66(1). He therefore sees a need to give considerable weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of all listed buildings”.

Robin Purchas’ QC recent judgement in **North Norfolk** is also noted “*inspector’s approach seems to me at this level to have balanced the relative harm and benefit as a matter of straightforward planning judgement without that special regard required under the statute*” (paragraph 73).

J. Lindblom’s recent judgment in **Forge Field** (12 June 2014) is also noted where it was held that having “special regard” or paying “special attention” involved more than merely giving weight to those matters in the planning balance: “preserving” in the context of s.66(1) and s.72(1) meant doing no harm. **There was a strong statutory presumption against granting planning permission for any development which would fail to preserve** a listed building’s setting or a conservation area’s character or appearance. A local authority was not allowed to treat the desirability of preserving those elements as mere material considerations to which it could simply attach such weight as it saw fit; when a local authority found that a proposed development would harm a listed building’s setting or a conservation area’s character and appearance, it had to give that harm considerable importance and weight.

Paragraph 49 of the **Forge Field** judgment states “*an authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering*”. The **South Lakeland (2014)** judgment also states “paragraph 134 is something of a trap for the unwary if read – and applied – in isolation” (paragraph 53).

The Ribble Valley Core Strategy is particularly relevant at Policy DME4, DMG1, DMG2 and DMH5.

The NPPF is particularly relevant at paragraph 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 17, 56 -57, 60-61, 109, 115, 118, 125, 126, 128 -129, 131 - 134, 137, 186 – 187 and Annex 2.

The NPPG is particularly relevant in stating:

“Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and effective conservation delivers wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits.

Distinctiveness is what often makes a place special and valued. It relies on physical aspects such as:

building forms;
details and materials;
style and vernacular.

Development should seek to promote character in townscape and landscape by responding to and reinforcing locally distinctive patterns of development,

Local building forms and details contribute to the distinctive qualities of a place. These can be successfully interpreted in new development without necessarily restricting the scope of the designer.

Plans, policies and decisions can effectively manage physical form at a variety of scales. This is how planning can help achieve good design and connected objectives. Where appropriate the following should be considered:

layout – the way in which buildings and spaces relate to each other

form – the shape of buildings

scale – the size of buildings

detailing – the important smaller elements of building and spaces

materials – what a building is made from

Materials should be practical, durable, affordable and attractive. Choosing the right materials can greatly help new development to fit harmoniously with its surroundings. They may not have to match, but colour, texture, grain and reflectivity can all support harmony.

A thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it.

The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places. For example, buildings that are in close proximity but are not visible from each other may have a historic or aesthetic connection that amplifies the experience of the significance of each.

When assessing any application for development which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change. They may also need to consider the fact that developments which materially detract from the asset's significance may also damage its economic viability now, or in the future, thereby threatening its ongoing conservation".

HEPPG - this is under review and in large respect has been replaced by Heritage England Advice PN2 and PN3. However, replacement advice for Part 6: Making Changes to Heritage Assets has not yet been published or consulted upon in draft.

HEPPG paragraph 80 'New development: design in context' states:

"A successful scheme will be one whose design has taken account of the following

characteristics of the surroundings, where appropriate:

1. The significance of nearby assets and the contribution of their setting.
2. The general character and distinctiveness of the local buildings, spaces, public realm and the landscape.
3. Landmarks and other features that are key to a sense of place.
4. The diversity or uniformity in style, construction, materials, detailing, decoration and period of existing buildings and spaces.
5. The topography.
6. Views into and from the site and its surroundings.
7. Green landscaping.
8. The current and historic uses in the area and the urban grain.

Some or all of these factors may influence the scale, height, massing, alignment, materials and proposed use in any successful design".

HEPPG paragraph 142 states:

"Each heritage asset and group of heritage assets has its own characteristics that are usually related to an original or subsequent function. These can include orientation, layout, plan-form, setting, materials, the disposition of openings, external detailing (with larger assets or groups of assets this might include street furniture) and internal fittings."

HEPPG paragraph 152 states:

“doors and windows are frequently key to the significance of a building”.

HEPPG paragraph 161 states:

“additions and changes in response to the changing needs of owners and occupants over time may themselves be a key part of the asset’s significance”.

HEPPG paragraph 178 states:

“The main issues to consider in proposals for additions to heritage assets, including new development in conservation areas, are proportion, height, massing, bulk, use of materials, use, relationship with adjacent assets, alignment and treatment of setting. Replicating a particular style may be less important, though there are circumstances when it may be appropriate. It would not normally be acceptable for new work to dominate the original asset or its setting in either scale, material or as a result of its siting. Assessment of an asset’s significance and its relationship to its setting will usually suggest the forms of extension that might be appropriate”.

HEPPG paragraph 179 states:

“the fabric will always be an important part of the asset’s significance. Retention of as much historic fabric as possible is therefore a fundamental part of any good alteration or conversion, together with the use of appropriate materials and methods of repair. It is not appropriate to sacrifice old work simply to accommodate the new”.

HEPPG paragraph 180 states:

“The junction between new work and the existing fabric needs particular attention, both for its impact on the significance of the existing asset and the impact on the contribution of its setting. Where possible it is preferable for new work to be reversible, so that changes can be undone without harm to historic fabric. However, reversibility alone does not justify alteration. If alteration is justified on other grounds then reversible alteration is preferable to non-reversible. New openings need to be considered in the context of the architectural and historic significance of that part of the asset. Where new work or additions make elements with significance redundant, such as doors or decorative features, there is likely to be less impact on the asset’s aesthetic, historic or evidential value if they are left in place”.

HEPPG paragraph 186 states:

“New features added to a building are less likely to have an impact on the significance if they follow the character of the building”.

HEPPG paragraph 181 states:

“When a building is adapted for new uses, its form as well as its external and internal features may impose constraints. Some degree of compromise in use may assist in retaining significance. For example, headroom may be restricted and daylight levels may be lower than usually expected”.

HEPPG paragraph 182 states:

“the plan form of a building is frequently one of its most important characteristics”.

HEPPG paragraph 192 states:

"Buildings will often have an important established and historic relationship with the landscaping that exists or used to exist around them. Proposals to alter or renew the landscaping are more likely to be acceptable if the design is based on a sound and well-researched understanding of the building's relationship with its setting, both now and in the past".

'Constructive Conservation in Practice' (English Heritage, 2008) states:

"Constructive Conservation is the broad term adopted by English Heritage for a positive and collaborative approach to conservation that focuses on actively managing change.

The aim is to recognise and reinforce the historic significance of places, while accommodating the changes necessary to ensure their continued use and enjoyment ...

... The Principles also underline the importance of a systematic and consistent approach to conservation. In order to provide this consistency, we are guided by a values-based approach to assessing heritage significance".

'Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment' (English Heritage, 2008) identifies four groups of heritage values: Evidential, Historical, Aesthetic and Communal.

"Evidential value, historical values and some aesthetic values, especially artistic ones, are dependent upon a place retaining (to varying degrees) the actual fabric that has been handed down from the past; but authenticity lies in whatever most truthfully reflects and embodies the values attached to the place (Principle 4.3). It can therefore relate to, for example, design or function, as well as fabric. Design values, particularly those associated with landscapes or buildings, may be harmed by losses resulting from disaster or physical decay, or through ill-considered alteration or accretion" (Paragraph 91).

The Forest of Bowland AONB Management Plan (April 2014 - March 2019) states:

"'Natural Beauty' is not just an aesthetic concept, and 'Landscape' means more than just 'scenery'. It can include flora, fauna and geological and physiographic features. The natural beauty of AONBs is partly due to nature, and is partly the product of many centuries of human modification of 'natural' features. Landscape encompasses everything – 'natural' and human – that makes an area distinctive: geology, climate, soil, plants, animals, communities, archaeology, buildings, the people who live in it, past and present, and perceptions of those who visit it" (page 7).

"The Forest of Bowland was formally designated an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) by Government on 10th February 1964. The area was designated as a landscape of national significance due to a variety of factors, including:

... The landscape's historic and cultural associations

... The distinctive pattern of settlements" (page 8).

"There is evident contrast in the villages in Bowland – some are typical estate villages while others are more haphazard farming settlements or industrial hamlets ... Collectively these historic and cultural elements of the environment serve to enrich the landscape's scenic quality, meaning and value" (page 12).

A Planning Inspector has recently confirmed ([APP/T2350/A/12/2174422](#), Cherry Hall, Grindleton) the Forest of Bowland AONB to be an acknowledged heritage asset.

The relationship between designated heritage assets and AONB character has also been

acknowledged at APP/T2350/A/13/2193965, Dog and Partridge, Tosside (paragraph 28) in respect to the change of use of the listed building:

“Overall I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the listed public house and would, consequently ... harm the character and appearance of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty”.

Heritage England ‘Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking’ (25 March 2015) states:

“Substantial harm is a high test which may not arise in many cases (paragraph 27).

The cumulative impact of incremental small-scale changes may have as great an effect on the significance of a heritage asset as a larger scale change. Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development to the asset itself or its setting, consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset in order to accord with NPPF policies” (paragraph 28).

‘Listing Selection Guide: Domestic 1: Vernacular Houses’ (Historic England, 2011) states:

“Vernacular houses, by which are meant houses built in the main from locally available materials that reflect custom and tradition more than mainstream architectural fashions, are a conspicuous and much-loved component of the English landscape, both rural and urban. They are also essential ingredients of local distinctiveness. They are irreplaceable documents of the past lives of our forebears who in the main left relatively few other direct traces, and provide important evidence for a range of historic building traditions” (page 2).

“Regional and local characteristics ... The assessment of the special interest of vernacular houses should take into account, amongst other things, how clearly they represent local geology, farming and tenorial practices, social hierarchies, and building traditions and materials. Buildings which are typical and representative of a region can have special interest and be listable, just as much as those considered exceptional or unusual: this is an important acknowledgment of the importance of local distinctiveness, a value which can attain national importance” (page 10).

“Alteration - Hardly any vernacular houses have escaped alteration over time, and many will have undergone several phases of change, reflecting altered concepts of privacy and hygiene, as well as the impact of other social and economic changes ... It is also worth saying that listing does not preclude the allowing of sympathetic alteration either: modern changes, in time, can themselves add to the continuing story of a house’s history ... Specialist functions - Many vernacular houses were not exclusively domestic in function. Farmhouses frequently incorporated a dairy, cheese room, apple loft or brew house reflecting local agricultural practice ... Most rooms of this sort have been converted to domestic uses, often making them difficult to identify (anomalies in plan-form, or variations in elaboration or building materials may furnish clues), but such features, where they survive in recognisable form, can add interest to the building as a whole” (page 11).

“Management consequences - The act of designation must be separated from ongoing management. Designation is the recognition of special interest: conservation is the application of appropriate interventions to ensure the ongoing viability of a building. At the heart of successful conservation is the recognition of the significance of a building – recognition of the grounds of special interest. This in no way rules out an acceptance that buildings should adapt. For instance, a small dwelling may be of significance for its humility, but this does not rule out appropriate adaptation for modern living. Fundamental to management is a full appreciation of the special qualities of a building, and a preparedness to work with them

rather than against them" (page 13).

'Farmstead Assessment Framework: informing sustainable development and the conservation of traditional farmsteads' (Historic England, April 2015) states:

"Traditional farmsteads and buildings make a fundamental contribution to both landscape character and local distinctiveness through their varied forms" (page 1).

"Introducing traditional farmsteads - Traditional buildings display an immense variation in their architectural form and use of materials. **Most date from the 19th century, rarely before, and few were built after the 1880s**" (page 2).

"Work to existing buildings - Retain existing historic openings and minimise alterations to prominent and significant external elevations, through careful attention to internal planning and how and where to introduce or borrow light. The size, proportion and detail of window and door design and materials has a major impact on overall appearance."

Minimise external lighting which can lend a suburban character to farmsteads" (page 11).

'Conversion of Traditional Farm buildings: A Guide to Good Practice' (Heritage England, October 2006; aimed at new conversions but its principles are relevant to the retention of significance in converted farm buildings) suggests:

"Farmsteads and their buildings must be understood in terms of the function or functions they were intended to house. Their scale and form are directly related to the historic land use of the area, which is also reflected in the wider landscape ... Buildings may in addition need to be understood as reflections of a particular vernacular building tradition or as expressions of a wider architectural or landscape design embracing a whole farmstead or perhaps an entire estate" (page 3).

"Design Issues – General principles - Understanding character, significance and context: this must inform the adaptation of any farmstead or building. It involves understanding the essential features of the building, its relationship to the wider landscape setting and its sensitivity to change ..."

Users may have to accept that the building imposes constraints that require some degree of compromise if its character and significance is to be retained" (page 10).

"Constructing new additions - There may be a good case for adding an extension to a historic farm building where this can safeguard the significance of the main building to be converted. An extension which houses ancillary functions requiring a high degree of partition can leave an undivided space free from subdivision, thus protecting its character. Extensions for other uses such as garages can have less justification particularly if there are existing outbuildings that can usefully serve the purpose. Overtly domestic extensions such as porches and usually conservatories are alien in character and can rarely work successfully within the context of historic farm buildings."

New extensions, be they a contemporary design or one based on an existing outbuilding, should be subordinate in scale and relate to the character of the farmstead group. They should not compromise the setting, so careful thought needs to be given to their siting" (page 29).

- Setting: a good understanding of the building's relationship with its immediate surroundings and landscape character will help to ensure that the new works conserve the relationship with the landscape" (page 10-11).

“Setting and surroundings – “with any type of conversion the impact upon the setting is a vital aspect of a successful project. A sensitive conversion respects the ties the building has with its landscape setting and avoids imposing alien features. This often requires a light touch and an understanding of what features characterise the setting and their relationship to the landscape. Attention to detail is a key aspect and consideration of public views of the farmstead is particularly important in areas of high landscape value” and

“Respecting the Farmstead’s Setting and Grouping ... nearly all farmsteads, therefore, have some form of enclosure either by the buildings themselves in the form of a courtyard or by connecting structures such as walls and gates. The other key characteristic of farmsteads is the way the landscape around a farmstead often flows up to the immediate edge of the buildings without any form of curtilage definition. These two key characteristics need to be respected ... extending gardens into what has been farming land requires planning permission and should be avoided if possible” (page 29).

‘Historic Farmsteads Preliminary Character Statement – NW region’ (Historic England, August 2006) states:

“The resulting diversity of form and scale is the direct outcome of the significant variation in farming practice and size that occurs both over time and from place to place. Individual farm buildings, for example, could be: ... Set out in strong linear groupings, especially in northern pastoral areas with little corn and longer winters and where there was an obvious advantage in having cattle and their fodder (primarily hay) under one roof” (page 40).

“Linear layouts (including the laithe house of the Pennines) are now most strongly associated with the hill farms of northern England (North East, North West and Yorkshire and the Humber). A major reason for the persistence of the layout in northern England was that it was suited to smaller farms (of 50 acres or less) needing fewer buildings – other than for the storage of subsistence levels of corn for the household and livestock, and the housing of some milk cattle, poultry and pigs. The close proximity of farmer and livestock during the winter months was another factor, cattle being stalled indoors from October to May. It was also a layout ideally suited to building along the contours of a hillside and so this farmstead plan remained in use in upland areas of England into the 19th century. Linear plans have often evolved as a result of gradual development, for example in the rebuilding of a lower end for the cattle as service area for the house, and the addition of new cow houses, stabling and barns in line. Linear layouts will often be associated with loose scatters or even yard arrangements of other farm buildings” (page 42).

At page 45 is a photograph of a linear plan within the Ribble Valley.

‘Listing Selection Guide: Agricultural Buildings’ (Historic England, 2011) states:

“Historic farmsteads and their buildings make a major contribution to the richly varied character of our countryside, and illustrate the long history of farming and settlement in the English landscape ... Farming practices have also varied enormously between regions resulting in a great diversity of building type and size and farmstead layout ... or set out in strong linear groupings, as in many upland areas of northern England” (page 2).

“The relationship between farm-based activities determines how buildings are arranged around the farmstead, and how they relate to the house. The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries witnessed increased efforts to unite these activities into one range, especially in pastoral areas with little corn and longer winters and where there was an obvious advantage in having cattle and their fodder in one enclosed building ... The broad farmstead plan types divide into: ... Linear and L-shaped plans where the house and working buildings are attached and in-line, which are concentrated in the upland areas of northern and western England and found in areas of smallholdings where part-time farmers were employed in local

industries ... Farmstead plans are of interest because they evidence local farming regions, and in time the emergence of more advanced agricultural regimes (or sometimes short-term enthusiasms) and because, along with natural landforms and field patterns, they are essential components of rural landscapes" (page 3).

"Architectural quality, survival and group value - a building which stands in a group with one or more listed structures (including the farmhouse) is more likely to be of interest than a sole survivor ... Reconstructed buildings - instances where buildings, primarily barns, have been dismantled and re-erected are quite common, and judgment will be needed as to the level of special interest of the resulting structure, and whether it retains a due degree of authenticity in its reconstruction ... Likewise, collapsed buildings may warrant retention on the list where it is possible to salvage significant parts of their structure for re-assembly: mere collapse alone will not be sufficient reason for de-listing ... 'Barn' conversions - Especially since the 1980s farm buildings have increasingly been converted to residential use ... Only in exceptional circumstances will such conversions warrant de-listing" (page 10).

'Historic Farm Buildings: Extending the evidence base' (Historic England, 2009) identifies that the linear farmstead is a building type under threat in the Ribble Valley:

"Divergences are found, however, between the geographical distributions of addressable-barn conversions and those of the overall stock of listed barns ... Where the number of 'addressable barns' is substantially higher than the overall population of listed barns might predict (such as in the Severn and Avon Vale NCA, and much of Cornwall), this appears to reflect both market pressure and the character of the stock itself. This is clearest in the Bowland Fringe and Pendle Hill NCA in Lancashire, where the density of 'addressable barns' is at its highest. Here, small linear farmsteads incorporating unlisted stone barns are particularly well suited, in terms of capacity, to residential conversion ... Although the annual flow of addressable conversions is equivalent to no more than 1 per cent of new building, it can have much more significant effects in some highly regulated contexts. Thus in the Bowland Fringe and Pendle Hill NCA, addressable barns constitute almost 5 per cent of the entire dwelling stock (outside urban areas and towns)" (Page 15-16).

Borough Council Conservation Area Management Guidance (The Conservation Studio consultants; subject to public consultation) states:

"Stonework: Alterations to wall surfaces are usually the most damaging that can be made to the overall appearance of a historic building. Alterations or repairs to external elevations should respect historic fabric and match it in materials, texture, quality and colour".

'Seeing the History in the View' (Historic England, 2011) states:

"The setting of any heritage asset is likely to include a variety of views of, across, or including that asset, and views of the surroundings from or through the asset" (page 5).

"Views are often kinetic (i.e. the observer is moving) and so, if necessary, there should be separate consideration and explanation of how the visibility and appearance of the heritage asset may change as the observer moves around the Viewing Place. This may include a description of the asset's visual relationship to other features in the view. Some views will have a more extensive Viewing Place than others" (page 13).

Ribble Valley comments on glazed extensions:

Townhead, Slaidburn (3/2009/0854) - The Georgian Group commented:

"Glazed links in particular, although intended to be low key and light in touch, tend in reality to

draw attention to themselves by their reflectiveness and by the characteristic tendency of any vitreous material to read as an opaque mass rather than something transparent”.

English Heritage commented:

“While it is understood that the structure would provide a clean and highly legible division between the historic house and new build, such a high proportion of reflective glass in a location where historically there has been predominantly stone may appear visually intrusive”.

Relevant appeal decisions in the Ribble Valley:

APP/T2350/E/08/2072213, Rodhill Lodge, Bolton By Bowland (8 August 2008). The list description for ‘Rodhill Gate Farmhouse’ (1954) does not refer to the adjoining barn or agricultural origins:

“Rodhill Lodge is formed from the conversion of part of a farm building, attached to the farmhouse

... I agree that the works of conversion that formed Rodhill Lodge were not particularly sensitive. The fenestration, in particular, is domestic in nature. However, while these works dimmed them to an extent, the agricultural origins of Rodhill Lodge are still readily discernible and an important constituent of the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

... as would the central double doors and stall riser. In my view, these features would appear suburban and incongruous. They would introduce further domestication that would harm the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

... I accept that views of the proposed conservatory from the public realm would be very limited but listed buildings are protected for their intrinsic value. The fact that the conservatory would be barely visible to anyone but the appellants is not a matter to which any great weight can be attached, therefore”.

In ‘Dry Stone Walls’ (2003) Garner suggests: 1.37m is the standard height for a dry stone wall (page 7); whilst there are regional variations, dry stone walls consist of two sides tapering towards the top, with the cavity between the sides filled with small stones and with *throughstones* at regular intervals to tie the sides together; by 1850 virtually all of the country’s agricultural walls had been built.

Submitted Information

The submitted site plan only includes part of the listed building within the ‘red line’.

The proposed floor plan identifies “Replace window with new doors” but this is not illustrated on the elevation plan.

The sketch drawing appears to be from an elevated viewpoint (wall top at same height as adjoining window sill) which does not convey the impact of the proposed 1.8m enclosing wall.

The Heritage Statement suggests:

“ample evidence” (3.3) for change to the building but “on the whole the materials and proportions are in keeping with traditional buildings of the district”.

the proposed extension’s bi-folding doors and single large window to the gable to be “something of a departure from the otherwise largely traditional appearance” (7.1).

“rear gardens and yards are probably more the rule than the exception for farmhouses in the region” (7.3).

the 1840 Chipping tithe map (3.4) to perhaps provide some historical precedent for the proposed extension of residential curtilage.

the main range’s twin span roof and the single storey wing at the north-east end mean that the house lacks the true linear layout which characterises many traditional North West farmhouses.

Conclusions

In my opinion, the proposed extension, patio door creation and enclosure of land to the rear within a 1.8m high wall will be harmful to the special architectural and historic interest and significance of the listed building and the character of the Forest of Bowland AONB.

The listed building has medieval origins (retained in its interior features) and has been altered by successive owners. This is not unusual (*“Hardly any vernacular houses have escaped alteration over time, and many will have undergone several phases of change”* Heritage England, 2011; *“Most date from the 19th century, rarely before, and few were built after the 1880s”* Historic Farmsteads in Heritage England, 2015) and was considered at the time of listing as a building of special architectural and historic interest. Application file reports suggest recent changes by the current owners (3/1999/0188 & 0189) have addressed unauthorised works and unsympathetic works (from use as a gamekeeper’s cottage). The Heritage Statement states that *“on the whole the materials and proportions are in keeping with traditional buildings of the district”*.

Map regression shows that the farmstead retains its distinct linearity. Historic England (2006) suggests that evolution of this farmstead type is to be expected *“Linear plans have often evolved as a result of gradual development, for example in the rebuilding of a lower end for the cattle as service area for the house, and the addition of new cow houses, stabling and barns in line. Linear layouts will often be associated with loose scatters or even yard arrangements of other farm buildings”*.

Map regression (including submitted 1840 tithe map) does not provide convincing evidence for land at the rear having previously been part of the residential curtilage (indeed the plans and interpretations submitted show the proposed site to be within the working area of the farm rather than in a possible ‘garden’). It provides no evidence for a walled garden at the rear (the 1892 OS shows the existing walled garden at the front and a walled enclosure at the rear which was infilled by the 1999 extension).

In my opinion, the proposed development is not sympathetic to the character and historic development of the farmstead and dominates/obscures the rear elevation of the listed building and its immediate setting. I would concur with the Heritage Statement that the extension and its glazing is “something of a departure from the otherwise largely traditional appearance”. The proposal would be overtly domestic and incongruous in the historic farmstead and conspicuous in views within the AONB. I also note from the Heritage Statement that “rear gardens and yards are probably more the rule than the exception for farmhouses in the region” suggesting the front walled garden and others to the south and east (possibly for solar aspect) at Wolfen Hall to be an interesting exception. Heritage England (2006) identifies *“nearly all farmsteads, therefore, have some form of enclosure either by the buildings themselves in the form of a courtyard or by connecting structures such as walls and gates. The other key characteristic of farmsteads is the way the landscape around a farmstead often flows up to the immediate edge of the buildings without any form of curtilage definition. These two key characteristics need to be respected ... extending gardens into what has been*

farming land requires planning permission and should be avoided if possible". The 'boundary' referred to at 3.4 of the Heritage Statement appears to be a stream.

In consideration to NPPG (*'substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases'*) and the impact on the designated heritage asset as a whole, harm is *'less than substantial'*. NPPF paragraph 134 requires that any 'public benefits' be considered and highlights the securing of the optimum viable use in this regard. The application submission does not suggest that any public benefit will ensue from the works. In my opinion and mindful of statutory duties and national and local policy, the very minor public benefit likely to result from contractor employment does not outweigh the harm to the designated heritage asset.

In my opinion, the landscape prominence of the proposal would result in a harmful impact upon the cultural heritage and character of the Forest of Bowland AONB.

Therefore, in attaching considerable importance and weight to the statutory duties at section 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (keeping the listed building, its setting and its features of architectural and historic interest free from harm), in giving great weight to conservation and with regard to Core Strategy Policies DME4, DMG1, DMG2 and DMH5 I would recommend that listed building consent and planning permission be refused.

RECOMMENDATION: That listed building consent and planning permission be refused.