

Peter Hitchen Architects

Peter Hitchen Architects Ltd

Marathon House
The Sidings Business Park
Whalley
Lancashire
BB7 9SE

1 September 2020

APPELLANT STATEMENT

PROPOSED NEW ACCOMODATION AT THE 3 MILLSTONES, WEST BRADFORD

THE SITE

The site comprises of an altered late 18th Century public house. It is located within the village of West Bradford. It sits at the back of pavement, taking access to the pub direct from the pavement, and also from the car park to the side and rear. It comprises of a 2 storey vernacular building, stone slate over whitewashed rubble stone.

West Bradford is located approximately 2 miles to the north of Clitheroe. The proposals building is on the southern side of Waddington Road, and to the east and south is a car park to the pub, whilst to the north is a terraced row of cottages. To the rear of the building, (west), is an area of open land and a car park.

Historic maps showing the development of the site from the 1840s to the present day are available. The mapping confirms that the building was extended to the east in the 19th century. The interior of the building has been altered over the course of time. The original form has been altered via a new ground floor extension to the rear, and the public house has a contemporary décor and feel.

A new accommodation annex has been constructed as approved under planning reference 3/2014/0614 and most recently the first floor area has been the subject of a recent planning approval under reference 3/2018/0956 to accommodate 5 additional guest bedrooms.

The building is Grade II Listed, and is also located within the West Bradford Conservation Area.

THE PLANNING APPLICATION (Planning application reference 3/2020/0329)

The application submitted on 23 April 2020 demonstrates a re-design of the originally refused design (application ref 3/2019/0554) and following the subsequent appeal dismissal in January 2020 (ref APP/T2350/W/19/3239000). The building is to be built on the same vacant land which is currently redundant at the rear of the property as the application submitted in 2019.

The proposal was resubmitted on the basis that the re-design directly addresses the key issues raised by the inspector. The design shows a dual pitch stone and render clad building with a small external patio area. The roof is finished in natural slate. The elevation to the south is a timber framed glazed wall incorporating the entrance into the room. A new timber fencing is proposed to define the pedestrian route to the existing building and to offer privacy to the new pod. The overall architectural aesthetic blends with the historic building.

THE PLANNING REFUSAL

The re-submission was refused planning permission on 24 August 2020 and the single reason is stated as follows :-

The proposed outbuilding is harmful to the setting of the listed building because it is incongruous, conspicuous and unduly prominent resulting from its size, asymmetric roof form, the form and material of its door opening and the obscuring of important views of the listed building's rear wall. This is contrary to Key Statement EN5 and Policies DME4 and DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

The appellant contests the reason on the basis that the new proposal has been the subject of a significant re-design in order to address the principal reasons for the appeal dismissal dated 7 January 2020.

The amendments to the design, (which was originally refused in 2019), include the following :-

1. Mono pitch zinc clad roof amended to a dual pitched slate roof
2. Timber cladding replaced with stone and render
3. Aluminium glazing replaced with timber glazing
4. Eaves heights reduced to below the level of the historic building

The 4 points above directly respond to the inspector's comments as outlined within paragraphs 8 -11 as highlighted within the appeal decision accompanying this statement. All other aspects of the proposal have been accepted by the inspector and the focus now remains on the scale/mass and architectural aesthetic of the proposal and its impact on the setting of the listed building.

The appellant does not accept the reason for the refusal on the basis that the case officer has failed to recognise the fundamental design changes which have been made as a direct response to the inspectors statements.

The size has been reduced, the roof form is now a traditional shape, the form and materiality of the door opening are respectful to the setting and the appellant fails to understand how a blank wall at the rear of the listed building is undermined by the position of the proposal.

We request that the afore mentioned paragraphs within the inspectors decision are related to the proposal which is the subject of this appeal and the appeal is therefore upheld.