

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2021

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9TH December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/21/3276880

2 Pinfold, Knowles Brow, Hurst Green BB7 9QX

- 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 Mr C MacAdam and Ms L O'Sullivan against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2021/0227, dated 24 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'alterations, extension, detached garage and external works'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to semi-detached dwelling. It is part of a pair which sit close to the highway within what is an attractive and largely unspoilt rural landscape. The quality of the landscape is recognised by its designation within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
 4. The ground floor lounge of the appeal dwelling is within the main body of the attached dwelling, which sits closest to the highway. The eaves and ridge of the main body of the appeal dwelling were originally much lower than those of the attached dwelling. The proposal includes an increase in the height of the eaves and ridge in order to create a full first floor. However, this work has been undertaken following the grant of planning permission (Ref. 3/21/0443). On this basis, it would serve no planning purpose for me to consider this element of the scheme further.
 5. The appeal proposal also seeks to add a two storey extension to the side of the enlarged dwelling. The proposed extension would have a lower ridge and eaves and the extension would be set in slightly from the front and rear elevations of the enlarged host dwelling. The Appellants suggest that the proposed two
-

storey extension would create a 'last step'. However it would be substantial in size. In fact, it would almost double the footprint of the host dwelling.

6. Furthermore, the extensive use of glazing and cladding would give the extension a contemporary appearance. Whilst contemporary design can sit comfortably in rural landscapes, in this instance, the chosen design and materials would be in stark contrast to the traditional appearance of the existing pair of dwellings. In my view, the effect would serve to emphasise the overall size of the proposed addition and would imbalance the existing dwellings.
7. As a result, I consider that the proposed extension would not be subservient and it would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its relationship with the attached dwelling. Furthermore, despite the presence of some trees and mature vegetation, the extension would appear unduly prominent within the landscape from several vantage points and it would fail to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB.
8. In addition, the proposal seeks planning permission for the erection of a detached garage which would be introduced to the entrance to the site, abutting the highway. Whilst the floor level of the garage would be at a lower level, it would be a somewhat isolated and overly prominent feature when viewed from the highway. Again, this element would harm the rural character of the surrounding area and the AONB.
9. The Appellants assert that the extension is required to provide a family sized home. However, this does not, in itself, justify a visually harmful form of development. The Appellants also point to the fact that largely positive pre-application advice was received from the Council. Whilst I understand that this may have been the source of some frustration, it is not binding on the Council. In any event, I have considered the proposal on its merits as I see it.
10. In addition, the Appellants argue that the extension would generate economic activity during the construction phase, but the same can be said of any domestic extension. Finally, the Appellants point to the fact that planning permission has been granted for an extension to the attached dwelling. However, this extension is very different in terms of its size, positioning and design and it is not comparable to the scheme before me.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development proposed would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and it would fail to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB. In such terms, it conflicts with policies DMG1, DMG2, DMH5 and EN2 of the adopted Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy 2008-2028, which collectively promote a high standard of building design that responds to its context and protects, preserves and where possible, enhances the AONB.
12. The arguments advanced by the Appellants do not outweigh this harm and policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR