
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by K Lancaster BA (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B2355/W/25/3366814

Land opposite the Coach House, Broadclough, Burnley Road, Bacup OL13 8PA

- 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 D Seymour against the decision of Rossendale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/0049.
 - The development proposed is a replacement lock-up garage (part retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr D Seymour against Rossendale Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. At my site visit, I observed that the development has partly commenced with the installation of a concrete base. I also observed that there is currently a shipping container on the site. However, approval is being sought for a replacement garage building, and I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.
4. I have also dealt with another appeal¹ on an adjacent parcel of land, within the same ownership. That appeal is the subject of a separate decision.
5. The land adjacent to the appeal site was also the subject of a recent appeal decision², which was dismissed. The appeal proposal was for the erection of a forestry building. Both parties have drawn my attention to this decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

7. The appeal site comprises the middle plot in a row of what previously contained three garages. An image provided by the appellant indicates the three garages were of a modest scale, set back from the road and of varying designs and styles. Only one of the garages now remains, after the middle and end plot were

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/B2355/W/25/3367109

² Appeal Ref: APP/B2355/W/23/3331767

demolished following storm damage in 2024. The garages are all in separate ownership.

8. The proposed development would involve the erection of a garage measuring approximately 9 metres in length, by 3.35 metres wide and 2.7 metres in height. The garage would replace the previous garage on the site. There is some dispute about the size of the original garage, with the appellant stating it was 8 metres in length, but the Council stating it was approximately 5 metres in length.
9. In terms of materials, the proposed garage would be constructed of mostly block work, with coursed natural stonework to the front elevation. It would have a flat roof and be of a similar height and width to the former garage. It is not disputed that the materials to be used would reflect local building materials, particularly the Coach House through the use of natural stone.
10. However, due to the positioning of the concrete base, the proposed garage would be sited further forward than the garage it would replace, and further forward than the retained garage. This siting, together with its increased length would result in a more prominent form of development that fails to respect the rural character of the site and the existing building which remains. Whilst I accept that it would not encroach significantly into the countryside, it would by virtue of its siting and scale be a harmful addition to the local area.
11. The Council has drawn my attention to a recent appeal decision³ on neighbouring land and also owned by the appellant. This decision relates to a proposal for a single storey storage building measuring approximately 14 metres by 8 metres, with a maximum height of 5 metres. However, in this case the size of the proposed building would be substantially smaller, and therefore not directly comparable to this proposal. It would also be viewed in a different context being that there is already an existing garage building immediately adjacent to the appeal site. Therefore, whilst I have had regard to the findings of this decision, I have nonetheless considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.
12. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. Thus, it would be contrary to Policies ENV1 and ENV3 of the Rossendale Local Plan 2019 to 2036, adopted December 2021 which requires amongst other things, development to take account of the character and appearance of the local area and to conserve the natural and built environment.

Other Matters

13. The Coach House⁴ and Broadclough Hall⁵ which are located on the opposite side of the road to the appeal site are Grade II Listed. I have therefore had regard to the statutory duty referred to in Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Broadclough Hall is constructed from stone with a low hipped slate roof, and The Coach House is constructed from ashlar with a hipped slate roof and long rectangular plan. The rear elevation backs onto the access road to the appeal site. The significance of these buildings lies in the use of traditional materials and design. Given the proximity and physical relationship of

³ Appeal Ref: APP/B2355/W/23/3331767

⁴ List Entry Number: 1361949

⁵ List Entry Number: 1163193

the proposal with these designated assets, their settings would be preserved, and the proposal would not cause harm to their significance.

14. Whilst the proposed garage would be sited closer to the road than was formerly the case, Highways have raised no concerns in relation to the proposal. The Council has also concluded that due to the distance of the appeal site to the closest neighbouring property, that there would be no harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Based on the evidence before me, and my own observations at the site visit, I see no reason to disagree with these conclusions.

Conclusion

15. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR