



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2021

**by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 16<sup>th</sup> December 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/21/3280704**

**Seven Acre Bungalow, Forty Acre Lane, Longridge, PR3 2TY**

- 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 Andrew Ball against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 3/2020/1062, dated 4 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 July 2021.
  - The development proposed is described as "*single storey extension to existing 1 bed bungalow (dwelling). Extension of existing domestic curtilage*".
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension to existing 1 bed bungalow and extension of existing domestic curtilage at Seven Acre Bungalow, Forty Acre Lane, Longridge, PR3 2TY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/2020/1062, dated 4 December 2020, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: LP Rev-A; 001 Rev-A; 002; 003; 004 Rev-C; 005; 006 Rev-A; 007 Rev-A.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
  - 4) The proposed hedge illustrated on Plan Ref 004 Rev-C shall be planted in the first planting season following the completion of the development; and any part of the hedge which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development dies, is removed or becomes seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with planting of similar size and species.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of both the host property and the surrounding area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modestly proportioned bungalow positioned on the edge of Longridge. It is on elevated ground and forms part of a small cluster of dwellings on the north western side of Forty Acre Lane.
4. The development would extend the host property to both the south and west and would create a significantly enlarged dwelling. The extension would be visible from 2 nearby footpaths that cross open land to the north and south west (Nos 9 and 11). However, its design would sympathetically integrate with the host property and its single storey height would limit any visual impact. It would also be seen against the backdrop of the existing group of dwellings, particularly from Footpath No 11 where views of the extension would be most pronounced. In this regard, its height would appear subordinate to the adjacent properties, which are all 2 stories in height. In my view, no significant harm would arise in these views of the property. Similarly, the development would be seen against this backdrop from any longer views from the north west, which in any case would be far more distant in nature.
5. It is also proposed to modestly extend the residential curtilage of the property to the south west. In this regard, Policy DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (2014) allows for such extensions where a property is on the edge of a settlement and the new curtilage brings the boundary into line with adjacent properties. The appeal site is located close to the settlement boundary for Longridge and is connected to it by neighbouring properties and a holiday park. In my view, it is on the edge of Longridge for the purposes of Policy DMH5. The proposed curtilage would also follow the line established by the boundary wall to Rock House. Moreover, the provision of a new boundary hedge would enhance the visual quality of the site when viewed from Footpath No 11, and this is capable of being secured by condition. The proposed curtilage extension would therefore accord with Policy DMH5.
6. The site has been subject to a recent appeal decision<sup>1</sup> for a replacement dwelling, which was dismissed. However, that development was for a large 2-storey house that would have extended out well beyond the boundary wall to Rock House. It would have been a far more imposing scheme than the current single storey proposal, and as a replacement dwelling it would have been assessed against other Core Strategy policies, notably Policy DMH3. I have therefore come to my own view on the current proposal.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not significantly harm the character and appearance of either the host property or the surrounding area. It would therefore accord with Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (2014). These policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that new development is of a high standard of design that respects the landscape character of the surrounding area.

## Other Matters

8. My attention has been drawn to the policies of the Longridge Neighbourhood Plan (2019), however, no specific conflict with its policies is alleged.

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/T2350/W/19/3228826

9. It is asserted that the access that serves Seven Acre Bungalow and adjacent properties has restricted visibility onto Forty Acre Lane. However, as the development is for a domestic extension only, I do not consider that it would lead to any significant intensification of the use of this access. I further note that the Highway Authority has not raised any concerns in this regard.

### **Conditions**

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition that requires the development to accord with the approved plans. This is necessary in the interest of certainty. Further conditions relating to external materials, and the planting of the proposed hedge, are also necessary in order to preserve the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Thomas Hatfield*

INSPECTOR