



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2012

by Stephen Roscoe BEng MSc CEng MICE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 December 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/12/2186531

The Granary at Bulcocks Farm, Pendleton, Clitheroe, Lancashire BB7 1PT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms J Farthing against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2012/0499, dated 6 December 2011, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2012.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension to a dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:
 - i) whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Pendleton Conservation Area; and
 - ii) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of Bulcocks Farm in relation to whether there would be any visual intrusion.

Reasons

Conservation Area

3. The appeal property is situated within the Pendleton Conservation Area (CA). The appeal dwelling lies in close proximity to the Grade II listed Bulcocks House. It is also very close to a dwelling known as Bulcocks Farm which is a former outbuilding that served Bulcocks House and is identified as a building of townscape merit in the Council's appraisal of the CA.
4. The appeal dwelling was also an outbuilding that served Bulcocks House and is visually closely related, but subservient to, Bulcocks House and Bulcocks Farm. It makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA, and its previous conversion to a dwelling secures its continued presence.
5. The front elevation of the proposed extension would be significant in area compared to that of the existing appeal dwelling, and particularly so in respect of the solid areas of the elevations, in other words excluding the openings. Furthermore, the timber cladding of the extension would accentuate the prominence of the front elevation of the extension. The proposed elevation would therefore visually compete with that of the existing appeal dwelling,

and indeed the front elevation of the nearby Bulcocks Farm, in an unacceptable manner.

6. The grouping of appeal dwelling, Bulcocks Farm and Bulcocks House is important in relation to the significance of the CA as together they retain a sense of their former shared purpose. The height and form of the mono-pitched roof of the proposed extension would approach the eaves level of the appeal dwelling, and the pitch of the roof would be steeper than that of the roof on the existing dwelling. These attributes would alter the form of the dwelling, which would then be generally out of keeping with the traditional first floor forms of Bulcocks Farm and Bulcocks House.
7. The volume and height of the extension would also result in the loss of the visual gap between the appeal dwelling and Bulcocks Farm in some three quarter views. This would be the case notwithstanding the use of matching stonework on parts of the extension, the use of conservation type rooflights and limited openings and the retention of a cart opening in and external steps on the original building.
8. The proposal therefore would not be inkeeping with the local and traditional geometric form as required by Local Plan¹ (LP) Saved Policy H17. It also would not exhibit a sufficiently high building design standard or preserve or enhance the CA in accordance with LP Saved Policies G1 and ENV16.
9. Whilst the proposal would change the character of this group of buildings, each case should be considered on its own merits. This change to the background character and appearance of the CA would however make it more difficult for the Council to resist other proposals that could cumulatively result in a greater loss of the character and appearance of the CA. This factor adds weight to the unacceptability of the proposal.
10. The proposed extension would be located in an area which was previously occupied by a two storey barn structure. This has however previously been demolished, and there is no evidence that it made any positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA or its significance as a heritage asset. Its former presence therefore carries little weight in this appeal. The proposed extension would only be visible from private properties and from a farm access lane. This limited visibility would not however be sufficient to outweigh the harm that has been identified.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Pendleton Conservation Area. I further conclude that it would, in this regard, thus conflict with Local Plan Saved Policies H17, G1 and ENV16.

Living Conditions

12. The gable wall of Bulcocks Farm would face, and lie in close proximity to, the proposed extension. The wall includes two windows and a glazed area in the upper part of an external door that serve a lounge. The lounge is however a dual aspect room with a further window on the front elevation of the barn. It also benefits from a clear glazed double leaf internal door which provides a further outdoor aspect through an adjoining hallway. As a

¹ Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan: June 1998

consequence of all of these factors, the extension would not be visually intrusive to the occupiers of the lounge.

13. The proposal therefore would not have an adverse effect on the amenity of the surrounding area or conflict with LP Saved Policy G1 in this regard. Furthermore, the mass of the extension would be acceptable and would not dominate in relation to the living conditions of nearby occupiers in accordance with LP Saved Policy H10 and the Council's SPG².
14. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of Bulcocks Farm in relation to visual intrusion. I further conclude that it thus would not conflict with Local Plan Saved Policies G1 and H10 in this regard together with the Council's SPG.

Other Matters

15. The accommodation provided within the existing appeal dwelling is small, particularly in relation to a ground floor shower room, which effectively has to operate with a wet room arrangement. The dwelling appears however to be occupied and its accommodation is not unacceptable. In this regard, the dwelling already contributes to the housing stock in the area, and the restricted accommodation would be no reason to allow the appeal.
16. The additional residential accommodation would be provided within a sustainable settlement location and would enhance the letting potential of the appeal dwelling. The protection of the historic environment in terms of the preservation of the character and appearance of the CA as a heritage asset however accords with the environmental dimension of sustainable development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. In this case, the protection of the heritage asset would outweigh these economic and social factors.

Conclusion

17. Although no harm has been found in relation to living conditions, this would not outweigh the adverse impact on the CA. Having also taken into account all other matters raised, none carry sufficient weight to alter the decision. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stephen Roscoe

INSPECTOR

² Ribble Valley Borough Council: Supplementary Planning Guidance: Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings: Version 1: September 2000

