

Wolfen Hall, Chipping

Appeal Reference: APP/T2350/E/14/2213092

Reasons for Appeal

- The Listed Building refusal relates to a dual application submitted in June 2013 for an open porch to the front of Wolfen Hall.
- The application included a Planning application and Listed Building application, which were both refused together on 9th August 2013.
- The appeal only relates to the Listed Building application as the Planning application was submitted as a Householder application and the opportunity to appeal ran out in November 2013.
- The Local Authority are/or will be aware of the appeal being on the refusal of Listed Building Consent and should the appeal be approved, their position on the Planning application will be reviewed.
- The appeal is being made for the following reasons:
 1. The porch will provide a useful amenity given the exposed position of the Hall.
 2. The porch will improve the architecture of the front elevation.
 3. A single storey porch previously existed in this position having been removed some years ago.
 4. This part of the house has been completely rebuilt over the last 50 years (see Heritage Statement attached).
 5. See section 6.1 of the Heritage Statement for an assessment of the impact.
- The reasons for refusal state that the porch will have a harmful impact upon the character and significance of the listed building because of the incongruity and dominance of in (or on) the front elevation and the obscuring of important historic features.

The first section is a subjective view and according to Stephen Haigh, the Archaeologist, the obscuring of important historic features is questionable.

- There is reference in the File Report to decisions being made in East Northamptonshire?
- There are references to numerous NPPF paragraphs including 131, 132 and 187. It would seem easy to quote paragraph numbers but these should be

read carefully in their context as set out in the NPPF, not to take lines or words where useful.

- Taking one paragraph out of the many, we ask the Inspector to ask the relevance of

“Size – the size of an extension is an important consideration. Over large extensions can dominate the original dwelling, they are also more likely to harm the amenities of neighbours. (5.2)”. If this quote or extract is of importance then all of the paragraphs should be questioned.

- Finally the officer considers in his conclusion that the “porch would be a dominant intrusion in the building range” – from this it follows that every Lancashire rural cottage up to Hall has a “dominant intrusion” to the front if it has as porch (which many have for environmental reasons.

We ask that the Inspector views this application objectively given the evidence, its location and history.

Thank you for your consideration.

Duncan N Isherwood RIBA

Draft Statement of Common Ground

Should the Inspector be minded to approve the appeal, we would be prepared to discuss any detailing / appearance / size of the proposed porch with the Planning Department of Ribble Valley Borough Council.