

# Peter Hitchen Architects

Peter Hitchen Architects Ltd  
Marathon House  
The Sidings Business Park  
Whalley  
Lancashire  
BB7 9SE  
4 October 2022

## APPELLANT STATEMENT CROW HILL COTTAGE, WORSTON, LANCASHIRE

### Proposed single storey garden room extension to the rear and new window openings.

This statement has been written to support the appeal against the recent planning refusal (ref 3/2022/0263) and listed building consent refusal (ref 3/2022/0491) issued by Ribble Valley Borough Council on 26 July 2022.

The appellant is aggrieved with the decision particularly when the proposal is compared to the approved design in 2008 in the same location at the rear of the house. We set out our case for the appeal as follows :-

### Reasons for refusal

*The proposals are unduly prominent, incongruous and conspicuous and harmful to the special architectural and historic interest and setting of the listed building and the character and appearance of Worston Conservation Area because of extension size, location, form and materials and new fenestration size, form and location. This is contrary to Key Statement ENV5 and Policy DMG1 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.*

*The proposals are unduly prominent, incongruous and conspicuous and harmful to the character of the Open Countryside because of extension size, location, form and materials. This is contrary to Key Statement ENV2 and Policy DMG1, DMH5 and DMG2 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.*

### Appellant remarks

We have analysed the case officer's decision and the comments to support the two reasons for refusal which he has outlined within the delegated report and we address the key issues directly as follows :-

The report confirms that planning and listed building consent was granted in 2008 as described below.

3/2008/0238 - Demolition of 1970s rear glazed porch and construction of a larger replacement green oak porch to rear. PP granted 13/5/2008.

3/2008/0239 - Demolition of 1970s rear glazed porch and construction of a larger replacement green oak porch to rear. LBC granted 13/5/2008.

The extremely detailed delegated report which we are contesting (extracted paragraphs in italics) is a far more comprehensive assessment than the delegated report from 2008 which is a rather perfunctory single sheet of A4. We believe the case officer has carried out an over sensitive and an unfairly pedantic assessment (using generic conservation statements) in comparison with the 2008 application.

We argue that this amended new proposal offers a very simple gabled form without the need to incorporate an extended flat roof area as previously approved. The materiality of an oak frame portrays an obvious intent to create a quality construction. It is worth noting that the appellant is satisfied to accept a condition for the roof materiality to be amended from slate to the grey slate to match the existing main house.

*The submitted Heritage Statement identifies that "The north end of the house and its link to the former barn are late 20th century, and do not confer significance, but they are clearly subservient in size, and their position in relation to the more prominent historic components means that the latter remain dominant in most views" (6.1). However, the proposed extension is unduly prominent (public right of way), incongruous and conspicuous because of its size, location, form and materials. The proposal extends a subservient modern link between historic house and barn; the gable roof is out of alignment with the distinct descending series of historic and modern gable roofs (see photograph in Worston Conservation Area Appraisal) of the house and the fully glazed gable (reflective; illuminated) is discordant in respect to the solid : void ratio found within the building complex.*

The extension has been designed to provide a modern distinct appearance using quality materials and repeating the 'descending' gable features which the case officer highlights. Currently the house has no connection to the garden area and the proposal will provide a space which complements the heritage of the house rather than attempting a pastiche style which would only add a further solid mass and offer no distinct evolution of the house

*The horizontally emphasised and 'wrap-around' form of the triple-light and size of the enlarged window to the north gable are also discordant and conspicuous features which draw the eye from the simple functional form and detail of the vernacular listed building.*

*The harm to the special architectural and historic interest and setting of the listed building does not include loss/alteration to irreplaceable historic fabric and is termed 'less than substantial'. The harm to the character and appearance of Worston Conservation Area is only partial in respect to the extent of this designated heritage asset and is termed 'less than substantial'. This harm is not outweighed by the public benefit of contractor employment (the applicant does not suggest any other public benefits for consideration).*

We highlight the important point that the alterations as proposed are all at the rear of the property and the alterations propose no planning harm to the existing building. The proposal at the rear of the property and its overall design concept is clearly a distinctive addition to the listed building and by virtue of its scale and location

We point out that the existing arrangement of the lead rolled flat roof and mono pitch at the rear is an incongruous relationship and this proposal portrays a simple and clear architectural language of oak framing and glazing which creates a far more pleasing aesthetic at the rear of the property and is in direct conflict with the two reasons for the refusal highlighted on the decision notice.



