## Peter Hitchen Architects

## Peter Hitchen Architects Ltd

Marathon House
The Sidings Business Park
Whalley
Lancashire
BB7 9SE
8 March 2020

## APPELLANT STATEMENT

The White House Sawley Road Sawley BB7 4LE Planning application reference 3/2019/0975

Alteration of the principal elevation to include a single-storey porch and a two-storey gabled elevation. Replacement conservatory with decked terrace to south west.

This statement has been written in order to challenge the reason for the refusal of the alterations as described above to the existing dwelling. The appellant has included all the relevant correspondence in association with the application and this should be read in conjunction with this statement.

The decision notice dated 31 January 2020 detailed one reason for the refusal as follows:-

The proposals have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of Sawley Conservation Area and the setting of vernacular listed buildings because of the undue prominence and conspicuousness of the modern building resulting from incongruous forms of extension, roof alteration and wall cladding. This is contrary to Key Statement EN5 and Policies DME4 and DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

The appellant wishes to draw to the attention of the planning inspectorate the detailed heritage statement produced by the independent consultant, within which are comments which relate to the context of the dwelling within the Sawley conservation area and the proximity to the abbey ruins. This statement should be read in association with the delegated report produced by the case officer to justify the reason for the refusal.

We point out that Historic England within their consultation letter dated 2 December 2019 offered no negative comments and recommended the appointment of a specialist heritage consultant which was acted upon by the appellant which resulted in the report by Stephen Haigh MA dated 21 January 2020.

It was apparent from the correspondence that the case officer was adamant from the outset of the application that it will be refused despite the appellant providing the statement from the heritage consultant which highlights matters which we request the inspector pays due regard to as we fee I that the case officer has been over vigilant in the assessment of the design and potential impact. We refer the inspector to the emailed correspondence between ourselves acting as agent and the case officer.

We also point out that design modifications to reduce the amount of glazing in the main façade were submitted to the case officer (see the confirmation email dated 27 January 2020). Drawing A201 was revised and submitted on this date but it is important to note that this is not included on the council's website.

We have included both the originally submitted design and the amended design within the appeal documents.

## To conclude :-

It has to be accepted that the house is one of an eclectic mix of dwellings of varied styles along the road opposite the abbey ruins. The appellant's house is not the only one which has a modern appearance (1970's) and the alterations which are proposed have a negligible impact on the conservation area's character and appearance. We suggest that there is no planning harm which the decision stipulates and says is supported by policies.

We recommend the inspector approaches the appellant's property from the south as you enter the village from the A59. The Inspector will see that there are numerous architectural styles along the western side of the road of varying age.

The proposal to refurbish, extend and improve the existing dwelling has no bearing on the heritage status of the area. We do not accept that the design portrays 'incongruous' forms or wall cladding.

We ask the Planning Inspectorate to uphold our appeal on the basis that the reason for the refusal cannot be justified on the grounds that the proposed alterations cause harm and affect the appearance and character of the Sawley Conservation Area.

Regards Peter Hitchen RIBA