



Ribble Valley  
Borough Council

[www.ribblevalley.gov.uk](http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk)

## **APPEAL STATEMENT**

### **TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

Appeal by Mr A Davies  
against the refusal of prior approval by  
Ribble Valley Borough Council for  
the change of use from agricultural building to one dwelling  
and associated operational development  
at Pinfold Farm Preston Road Ribchester PR3 3YD.

**Planning Inspectorate Reference:  
APP/T2350/W/21/3274371**

**STATEMENT OF CASE SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF  
THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The appeal relates to the refusal of prior approval issued by Ribble Valley Borough Council on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2021 for change of use from agricultural building to one dwelling and associated operational development at Pinfold Farmhouse, Preston Road, Ribchester.
- 1.2 An application to determine whether the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority was required was submitted in January 2021. Prior approval was refused on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2021 for the following reason:
  - 1.2.1 The external appearance of building, having particular regard to overall design, external materials and fenestrational arrangement would result in the introduction of a proposal of an overtly suburban character which would be read as an anomalous, incongruous and discordant introduction which would be visually incompatible with and unsympathetic to its rural surroundings in conflict with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and Q.2(f) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

### **Appeal Site and Surrounding Context**

- 1.3 The appeal relates to Pinfold Farm, located off Preston Road, Ribchester. The site is located within a predominantly rural area largely typified by open agricultural land with some scattered and isolated dwellings/farmsteads also occupying the landscape.
- 1.4 The wider site is occupied by residential dwellings at the front of the site with more traditional agricultural buildings at the rear.

### **Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance**

- 1.5 The planning policy context for the appeal site is set out at national level by the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and at local level by the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (adopted version). The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 also applies to this appeal.

### **Planning History**

- 1.6 **3/2020/0855:** Proposed change of use from agricultural building to one dwelling and associated operational development. Refused December 2020
- 1.7 **3/2012/0546:** Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for the proposed conversion of the garage into annex accommodation. Granted
- 1.8 **3/2011/0153:** Application for the removal of condition no.2 of planning consent 3/2005/0615P, to allow the holiday let to be used as a permanent separate residential dwelling. Approved

## 2. CASE FOR THE LOCAL AUTHORITY

- 2.1 The appeal proposals include development under Class Q(a) and Class Q(b) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order which requires the developer to apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority will be required for:
- (a) transport and highways impacts of the development,
  - (b) noise impacts of the development,
  - (c) contamination risks on the site,
  - (d) flooding risks on the site,
  - (e) whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the building to change from agricultural use to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order, and
  - (f) the design or external appearance of the building
- 2.2 All matters were considered as part of the assessment of the application and the application was refused solely on the grounds of paragraph Q2(f) in respect of the design and external appearance of the proposed development.
- 2.3 Design is a relatively subjective matter for Prior Approval. The Local Planning Authority consider that the design and appearance of any Class Q conversion should be in keeping with the rural character of the setting. In this regard buildings are 'converted' and not rebuilt, and it is considered that any external changes should be minimal.
- 2.4 In this case it is considered that the external appearance of the resultant building in respect of the design, external materials and fenestration details would create a building with a suburban character which would be incongruous and conflict visually with the rural character of the area.
- 2.5 On 20th July 2021 the new National Planning Policy Framework was published with strengthened emphasis on design quality. Chapter 12 focusses on 'beautiful' development. A test that development should be well-designed, confirming that development which "fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes" should be refused.
- 2.6 Paragraph 134 continues to confirm that "significant weight" should be given to "development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes". Significant weight should also be given to "outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings".
- 2.7 Alongside the revised Framework the National Model Design Code was published which sets a baseline standard of quality and practice which local planning authorities are expected to take into account when developing local design codes and guides and when determining planning applications, including: ...

- 2.7.1 the factors to be considered when determining whether façades of buildings are of sufficiently high quality
- 2.7.2 that developments should clearly take account of local vernacular and heritage, architecture and materials

2.8 it is not considered that the design of the development respects the character of the existing agricultural barn or the rural area. The development does not represent high quality design which the revised Framework and accompanying Design Code seeks to achieve.

### **3. COMMENTS ON THE APPELLANTS GROUNDS FOR APPEAL**

- 3.1 The appellant considers that the design of the development is acceptable by virtue of the use of louvers to minimise the glazed areas, referencing the barn door opening with glazing and the use of timber.
- 3.2 The LPA consider that the use of louvres is a modern addition to the building and would not be a typical feature of a barn. The end gable glazing arrangements do not respect the character of this agricultural building with functional barn doors at one end which are not mirrored at the opposite end as detailed on the proposed development. The introduction of floor to ridge timber panelling detracts from the appearance of the traditional agricultural building and the introduction of roof lights and sporadic openings would not be typically associated with this type of building. All the proposed features create a more urban type of development at conflict with the rural character of the area.
- 3.3 The appellant has cited other appeal decisions in support of their case as follows:
  - 3.3.1 APP/Y1138/W/20/3244988
  - 3.3.2 APP/W4705/W/20/3250397
- 3.4 Along with other cited schemes in Blackburn with Darwen and the Ribble Valley. Whilst each development is considered on its own merit in this case it was not considered that the development represents high quality design and would create a suburban appearance. Given the increased focus on design within the Framework and the LPAs intention to secure high quality design out of all new developments it is not considered that the appeal proposals represent the high level of design being sought.

**4. CONCLUSION**

2.1 Having regard to all the above it is respectfully requested that the appeal be dismissed.

**5. CONDITIONS**

3.1 If the Inspector considers that prior approval in this case if required and acceptable the following condition is suggested:

- TBC