


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:		Date:		Manager:		Date:	
Site Notice displayed		Photos uploaded						

Application Ref:	3/2021/0410	 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk
Date Inspected:	15/7/2021	
Officer:	AD	
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:		Decision Refusal

Development Description:	Proposed conversion of part of barn to one bedroomed dwelling and creation of a garden and parking area (part retrospective)
Site Address/Location:	Parker Place Farm Pendleton Road Wiswell BB7 9BZ

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
No comments received.	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
LCC Highways:	
<p>No objection subject to conditions (no impact to public footpath; no danger to public footpath users during construction; parking and turning facilities implemented before occupation) and informatives (no entitlement from planning permission to obstruct a right of way; responsibility for damage to surface of public right of way).</p> <p>LCC Archaeology:</p> <p>Given the small scale of the development and the fact that this application is partly retrospective it seems disproportionate to advise any large amount of building recording. However, it would be useful to have a formal record of the building before conversion and a photographic record made up for existing photos from the various reports accompanying the application, and any others that may have been taken that show features of the interior prior to it being dry lined. The architect's conservation specialist should be able to advise on the appropriate structure of such a record, basing it on the Historic England publication "Understanding Historic Buildings: A guide to good recording practice."</p>	
CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
None received.	

RELEVANT POLICIES:
<p><i>Ribble Valley Core Strategy:</i></p> <p>Key Statement DS1 – Development Strategy Key Statement EN2 – Landscape Key Statement EN5 – Heritage Assets Key Statement DMI2 – Transport Considerations Policy DMG1 – General Considerations</p>

Policy DMG2 – Strategic Considerations
Policy DME1 – Protecting Trees and Woodlands
Policy DME2 – Landscape and Townscape Protection
Policy DME3 – Site and Species Protection and Conservation
Policy DME4 – Protecting Heritage Assets
Policy DME6 – Water Management
Policy DMH3 – Dwellings in the Open Countryside and AONB
Policy DMH4 – The Conversion of Barns and other Buildings to Dwellings

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. ‘Preservation’ in the duty at section 66 of the Act means “doing no harm to” (*South Lakeland DC v. Secretary of State for the Environment* [1992]).

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

Relevant Planning History:

No Pre-application advice was sought.

3/2018/0759 – Retention and modification of converted shipping container to form one bedroom holiday accommodation with vehicular access and parking. PP granted 9/10/2018. The file report identifies “the detached barn is also considered to be listed by curtilage”. The submitted planning statement identifies “It does not adversely affect or harm the setting of the traditional stone barn to Parker Place Farm”.

3/1998/0030N - Erect agricultural implement store with mono pitch. PP granted 5/1/1999.

3/1974/0231 – Conversion of barn to residential use. Planning permission (outline?) granted 27/6/1974.

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Site Description and Surrounding Area:

Parker Place Farmhouse is a Grade II listed (13/2/1967) house of the mid C18 on the lower NW slopes of the Pendle Hill Forest of Bowland outlier. The farmstead comprises the farmhouse (front to NW – see list description), a perpendicular stone barn range to the north and a smaller stone outbuilding to the NW.

The site is prominently sited in relation to the public rights of way network. Public footpath 3-47-FP-13 runs from the Pendleton Road to the farmyard and then along the contour directly behind the barn and farmhouse.

The site is within the setting of Wiswell Eaves House (Grade II; c.1700) to the south – similarly sited Pendle Hill farmstead.

The submitted Heritage Statement identifies:

The Heritage Statement contests that the barn is part of the listing under section 1 (5) of the Act. This is based on the barn not being in ancillary use to the farmhouse – however, no historic information identifying use prior to the implementation of the unauthorised works has been submitted;

“The barn forms part of a small group of only two buildings, the other being the extant farmhouse, established at Parker Place Farm by the mid-19th century. The central section is the earliest part of the building and dates from the 1790’s, possibly with the inclusion of the rear, single storey outshut to the north corner of the building. OS mapping from the mid-19th century shows the original extent of the barn

as built in the late 18th century and included a central projecting structure to the front south west elevation, likely to be a central wagon entry porch” (5.1.1);

“The farmhouse and barn provide physical evidence of settlement and agriculture, and likely originate from the late 18th century ... The barn in particular consists of multiple phases of construction, with the affected section of the barn likely dating from the late 19th / early 20th century, and suggests the possible success and prosperity of the farm” (6.1.2);

“The farmhouse and barn are the product of local vernacular building tradition which is prevalent amongst such buildings within the region and would have been constructed using locally sourced materials and skilled craftsmen. Barns in particular display very little conscious design given that their construction was primarily focused on the intended function of the building and architectural merit was considered to be of little importance. This can be said the barn at Parker Place Farm as it has little in the way of architectural embellishment. However, the simple stone-built appearance of the barn does have a level of attractiveness” (6.2.2);

“The setting of the farm remains relatively unchanged with the exception of a number of modern outbuildings located to the north which detracts from the agricultural and rural character of the site” (6.4.4);

“In terms of illustrative historic interest, the buildings are evidence of a modest late 18th century farmstead, likely belonging to a tenant farmer or yeoman farmer, and provide a limited insight into the domestic and agricultural use of the site” (6.3.3);

“The significance of the barn is derived from its extant historic fabric and its evidence of historical development through enlargement as indicated by a number of additions to the building, likely having occurred throughout the 19th century and possibly into the early 20th century. The building, having likely been built in the late 18th century, belongs to the 1750 – 1880 period in which many of the nation’s agricultural building stock was constructed” (6.5.2);

“Its significance is also derived from its exterior appearance which is vernacular in character” (6.5.3);

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

Planning permission is sought (largely retrospectively) for the conversion of part of the barn range to a dwelling. A garden area and parking spaces are shown.

Unfortunately, the submitted plans do not clarify the impact of the unauthorised works – existing and proposed drawings are very similar (see proposed drawing for 3/1974/0231 showing no openings to the east gable). Only recent photographs have been submitted. However, the submitted Heritage Statement (7.1.1) identifies that the following works have been undertaken (case officer notes following site inspection in brackets):

Repointing of external stonework (*however, no details of mortar mix other than ‘lime mortar’ in works specification*)

Replacement of rainwater goods (*no rainwater goods on rest of barn – is this a new feature?*)

Re-roofing using existing stone slates and ridge tiles. The existing timber roof structure has been retained. Installation of oak fascia and barge boards. (*no fascia and barge boards on rest of barn – is this a new feature?*)

Installation of timber effect double glazed windows (*i.e. plastic imitating stained timber*).

Installation of oak external doors.

Installation of 2no flush fitting conservation roof lights to the north and south roof slopes to replace preexisting glass slates. (*there are x2 rooflights to the south elevation facing the farmhouse*)

Internal refurbishment and drylining (*no details submitted in respect to any impacts to building 'breathability'*).

The applicant also confirmed on site that this part of the barn range has been cleaned.

A Structural Appraisal has been submitted which identifies:

"Description ... built as an extension to the original double height central barn at some time in the past. We are informed by the client that this area was previously used as a hay store ... windows and doors have natural stone heads and cills. Some of which have been replaced with new during the conversion work. New UPVC windows and doors have been installed to the openings ... Some of the internal timber lintels have been replaced with concrete lintels ... informed by the client that he has installed a new ventilated warm roof construction ... The first floor is of timber construction. The existing 175 x 75 joists span from the front to the back of the building supported at mid span by a newly installed 203x133 steel beam ... The ground floor consists of a new slab on solid construction. A visqueen barrier has been installed onto hardcore and lapped approximately 1m up the face of the existing barn walls. Above this is a 100mm concrete slab with insulation and a floating floor finish".

"External walls ... We note that some of the stone heads and jambs have been replaced with new".

"Roof construction ... We were informed by the owner of the building that the existing roof was taken off and new battens, felt and insulation has been installed as part of the conversion work".

"Overall stability ... as the Eastern section of the barn appears to be an extension to the original building, we are satisfied that the proposed works to this section of the barn do not have any structural implications on the barn as a whole".

"Discussion and recommendations ... The existing structural elements of the barn: walls, roof and floor, appear to be in sound structural condition with no visual signs to indicate any recent movement of the foundations or other structural defects".

"Introduction ... This report focuses on a small section of the barn to the East of the main barn building, highlighted in red on the site layout plan in Appendix A. We have not carried out a full inspection of the remaining sections of the barn building, however a cursory review of the buildings overall condition and stability was undertaken".

A modern corrugated roofed lean-to (of recent appearance but with late C19 dated hopper) has been attached to the south elevation (facing the farmhouse). However, this is not identified on the submitted plans.

The submitted bat survey conclusions identifies:

"Nature conservation is important to the owner of the building and it can be confirmed that no protected species were disturbed during the work nor any signs of historic presence of Bats found. The location provides optimal roost and forage potential for bats".

Impact upon the setting of the listed building and the cultural heritage of the Forest of Bowland AONB:

It is noted from the Heritage Statement that *"The barn forms part of a small group of only two buildings, the other being the extant farmhouse"* and *"The farmhouse and barn are the product of local vernacular building tradition which is prevalent amongst such buildings within the region and would have been constructed using locally sourced materials and skilled craftsmen. Barns in particular display very little conscious design given that their construction was primarily focused on the intended function of the building"*.

The implemented works are conspicuous and incongruous and have had a harmful impact upon the harmonic relationship of farmhouse and barn and the setting of the listed building because of the materials (plastic windows imitating stained timber; largely glazed door to gable; lean-to corrugated roof; no evidence submitted to justify replacement of historic stone heads and jambs) used and domestic form (x2 rooflights breaking up stone slate roof facing house; weathervane; soil pipe; rainwater goods including spuriously dated hoppers; verge and bargeboards) of alterations in the conversion.

The proposals are contrary to Key Statement EN5 and Policies DME4 and DMG1. Key Statement EN5 (*"Heritage Assets and their settings will be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance for their heritage value; their important contribution to local character, distinctiveness and sense of place; and to wider social, cultural and environmental benefits"*). Policy DME4 identifies that the Borough Council will not support *"alterations or extensions to listed buildings ... or development proposals on sites within their setting which cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset"*. Policy DMG1 identifies that *"all development must protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings"* and *"all development must: Design 1. be of a high standard of building design which considers the 8 Building in Context Principles (from the CABE/English Heritage building in Context Toolkit. 2. be 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"*.

The most relevant Building in Context Principles are:

Principle 5 - A successful project will respect important views

Principle 7 - A successful project will use materials and building methods which are as high quality as those used in existing buildings

The National Design Guide (2021) is particularly relevant at C1 and C2:

"Well-designed new development is integrated into its wider surroundings, physically, socially and visually. It is carefully sited and designed, and is demonstrably based on an understanding of the existing situation, including: the landscape character and how places or developments sit within the landscape" (paragraph 43).

"Well-designed places and buildings are influenced positively by: the history and heritage of the site, its surroundings and the wider area, including cultural influences" (paragraph 48).

The proposals are contrary to Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1 and DMG2 which seek the retention of the AONB's local distinctiveness and its building's vernacular style and scale.

The Forest of Bowland AONB Management Plan (April 2014 - March 2019) identifies *"The natural beauty of AONBs is partly due to nature, and is partly the product of many centuries of human modification of 'natural' features ... 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 ... Collectively these historic and cultural elements of the environment serve to enrich the landscape's scenic quality, meaning and value"*. See NPPF 172 'important consideration'.

Key Statement EN2 requires: *"The landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected, conserved and enhanced. Any development will need to contribute to the conservation of the natural beauty of the area ... As a principle the Council will expect development to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, style, features and building materials"*.

Policy DMG2 requires: *"in protecting the designated area of outstanding natural beauty ... development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the AONB by virtue of its size, design, use of material, landscaping and siting. The*

AONB Management Plan should be considered and will be used by the council in determining planning applications”.

NPPG states that “substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases”. The works do not affect the historic fabric of the building identified in the list description - harm is ‘less than substantial’.

NPPF paragraph 196 requires that ‘less than substantial’ harm be weighed against any public benefits of proposals. The Heritage Statement identifies that there will be a net increase in the number of dwellings on the site but the Core Strategy Development Strategy (Key Statement DS1) does not prioritise such a location for new housing and Policy DMH4 (The Conversion of Barns and other Buildings to Dwellings) and its sub-text requires that “there would be no materially damaging effect on the landscape qualities of the area” and “the conversion of buildings should be of a high standard and in keeping with local tradition”. The Planning Statement suggests that the part conversion to a dwelling is the optimal viable use for the building but no information as to alternative uses considered (including mothballing) and marketed has been submitted. Furthermore, little information (see structural appraisal) has been received in respect to the impact of development on the conservation of the barn as a whole. Construction employment is a public benefit. Public benefits do not outweigh the harm to the setting of the listed building.

Residential Amenity:

The proposals have an acceptable impact upon the amenity of nearby residents.

Highways:

The comments of LCC Highways have been considered.

Bats:

The conclusions of the submitted bat survey have been considered.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

Therefore, in giving considerable importance and weight to the duty at section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and in consideration to NPPF and Key Statement EN2 and EN5 and Policy DME4, DMG1, DMG2 and DMH4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy it is recommended that planning permission be refused.

RECOMMENDATION:

That planning permission be refused for the following reason:

The development is conspicuous and incongruous and has a harmful impact upon the setting of the listed building (including the harmonic visual relationship of farmhouse and barn) and the cultural heritage of the Forest of Bowland AONB because of the materials used and overtly domestic form of alterations in the conversion. This is contrary to Key Statement EN2 and EN5 and Policy DMG1, DMG2, DME4 and DMH4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.