



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2025

by **J M Tweddle BSc(Hons) MSc(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/25/3366533

10 Barker Lane, Mellor, Lancashire BB2 7ED

- 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 Lukman Patel against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
- The application Ref is 3/2025/0190.
- The development proposed is described as the 'demolition of existing single storey porch/ bedroom/ utility, car port, conservatory and detached garage. Construction of two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and new front porch. Replacement windows and doors, alterations and resurfacing of driveway and installation of solar panels and render finish to SE side elevation.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies;
 - The effect of the development on the openness of the Green Belt, and;
 - Whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two-storey dwelling at 10 Barker Lane and is located within the Green Belt. The proposal would result in various extensions to the property, including a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension, and a new front porch. Some existing parts of the property would be demolished to facilitate these enlargements and replacement windows and doors are also proposed along with the resurfacing of the drive and the installation of solar panels.

Whether inappropriate development

4. The Framework states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 154 of the Framework establishes that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate, subject to specific exemptions. One such exception being the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

5. The Framework does not provide a definition of disproportionate additions, and no local guidance or policies are before me in this regard. Therefore, an assessment of whether a proposal would amount to a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building is a matter of planning judgement.
6. Based on the volumetric calculations provided by the appellant, the proposal would result in a 60.9% increase in cubic volume over the original building. The additional built form and floorspace would add significantly to the bulk and massing of the original building. These increases would amount to substantial additions to the original building, which I find to be disproportionate over and above the size of the original building.
7. For these reasons, the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which is, by definition, harmful. It would therefore conflict with the policies of the Framework.
8. The LPA cites conflict with Key Statement EN1 of the Core Strategy 2008-2028, a Local Plan for Ribble Valley (adopted in 2014). This policy seeks to maintain the overall extent of the Green Belt to safeguard the surrounding countryside from inappropriate encroachment and states that the development of new buildings will be limited to certain types that preserve openness and do not conflict with the purposes of the designation. In this case, the development does not result in a new building, and there would be no encroachment into the countryside. Therefore, I find no direct conflict with Key Statement EN1. Nevertheless, this does alter the fact that the appeal proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, when assessed against the policies of the Framework.

Openness

9. Openness is an essential characteristic of the Green Belt that has both visual and spatial aspects. The appeal property is highly visible from public views along the street. Despite being located within an existing built-up area, the proposed extensions would add large additions to the property that would significantly increase its volume and overall visual massing.
10. This would reduce the undeveloped space around the property, resulting in a harmful loss of openness. However, this would be limited given the scale of the proposal and its surrounding context.

Other Considerations

11. As set out above, the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. I have also found harm to the openness of the Green Belt. I am required to give substantial weight to these harms. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the harm to the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
12. To justify the proposal, the appellant has drawn my attention to a previous grant of planning permission¹ (the 2024 permission) for extensions to the property. I have no reason to doubt that this is a legitimate fallback position that could be carried out in the event of this appeal being dismissed. I must therefore consider whether the fallback would be more harmful than the appeal scheme, have a similar effect, or would be less harmful.

¹ Planning Permission Ref. 3/2024/0803, granted on 28 November 2024

13. The appeal proposal would result in 21.29sqm of additional floor space, when compared against the 2024 permission. This represents an additional 8.74%. Furthermore, the 2024 permission would result in a 43.4% increase in cubic volume over that of the original building. This is significantly less than the 60.9% increase in cubic volume proposed by the appeal. Therefore, the appeal proposal would have a larger footprint, and a greater volumetric increase than what could be achieved by the implementation of the 2024 permission.
14. Consequently, the fallback position represents a significantly less harmful proposition than the appeal proposal. It does not therefore add weight in favour of the appeal.
15. My attention has also been drawn to a nearby appeal decision² that allowed the erection of two detached houses following demolition of an existing house at 30 Barker Lane. However, this is not a comparable type of development, and in that case a different exemption for 'limited infilling' was found to apply. As such, this attracts very little weight.

Conclusion

16. I have not found conflict with the development plan. Nevertheless, the Framework is a material consideration against which the appeal must be assessed.
17. The proposal would be inappropriate development in the terms set out by the Framework and would result in a harmful loss of openness to the Green Belt. The Framework requires that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt.
18. The other considerations advanced in this case do not clearly outweigh the substantial weight which must be given to Green Belt harm. Therefore, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist. Consequently, the appeal cannot succeed.

J M Tweddle

INSPECTOR

² APP/T2350/W/16/3164118