



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2025

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/25/3368992

12 Central Avenue, Clitheroe, Lancashire BB7 2PZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Haworth against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 3/2024/0146.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 2-storey side extension to the east elevation of the existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one half of a semi-detached pair within an estate style residential area. It stands at the end of a row of 3 pairs that are similar in design with a layout that forms a gentle arc that is slightly set back from the road. The broad symmetry of the pair to which No 12 belongs, and the resultant pattern of this row of 3 pairs, is a characteristic feature of the street scene. It is locally distinctive.
4. The proposed extension has been carefully designed to match the hipped roof, materials, eaves level and pattern of fenestration of the existing dwelling. Although the new addition would be set back from the main front wall and set down from the roof ridge, the rear corner would be within a short distance of the site's side boundary. On the immediate approaches to the site along Central Avenue, the front corner of the new addition would also appear to project beyond the front build line of the adjacent pair. Furthermore, by extending the front elevation of No 12 by about 4-metres, the proposal would also disrupt the general symmetry with its attached counterpart by unbalancing their front facades.
5. As a result, the finished dwelling would relate uneasily with the existing buildings on either side of the site. It would draw the eye from the road as an incongruous and discordant element because both the pair of which No 12 forms part, and the established pattern and rhythm of the row of 3 pairs, would be unduly disrupted.
6. During the site visit, I saw that some properties in the local area had been externally altered and extended at the side, most notably 18 Central Avenue, which forms part of the central pair in the same row as No 12. Unlike the appeal dwelling,

No 18 is orientated parallel to the road and so it has a different relationship to the buildings on either side than the appeal dwelling. This arrangement also means that the side extension of No 18 is no closer to the road than the host building. Therefore, the extension is a less prominent feature in the streetscape than would be the case with the proposal before me.

7. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area. As such, it conflicts with Policy DMG1 of the Council's Core Strategy 2008–2028. This policy aims to ensure that all development achieves a high standard of design and takes into account the layout and relationship between buildings.
8. The appeal scheme is also at odds with the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). These policies state that development, amongst other things, should be sympathetic to local character and add to the overall quality of the area.

Conclusion

9. Overall, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan, when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR