



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 4 May 2021

by **Mr M Brooker (Inspector)**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/W/20/3265544

Black Horse Inn, Pimlico, Clitheroe, BB7 4PZ

- 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 Ribble Valley Developments against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2020/0367, dated 25 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as “change of use and extension of the Black Horse Inn to residential dwellings and associated landscaping and parking.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy requires that new development must, amongst other matters, “consider the density, layout, and relationship between buildings, which is of major importance. Particular emphasis will be placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings, including impact on landscape character, as well as the effects of development on existing amenities”.
4. The appeal property is identified as being a non-designated heritage asset, while the officer’s report notes that extensive modifications in the past have resulted in the loss of original features. The property nonetheless presents a character commiserate with its age.
5. The appeal property forms part of a terrace of stone-built cottages of a simple and largely uncluttered appearance. I note that there is a distinct step in the roof level of part of the terrace, this is also reflected in a change of other features of the elevations such as the windows.
6. The submitted plans show that the proposed development would significantly increase the roof height, above that of the immediately adjoining properties. The Officer’s report details that the proposed development would raise the roof of the appeal property by over 1 metre. Windows and other features of the front elevation would remain unaltered.

7. While the appellant details that the proposed scheme has been designed to mirror the existing step in the roof height. Nonetheless, I saw at the site visit that the resulting development would harm the simple profile of the roof form and scale of the building. Consequently, the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.
8. To the rear elevation, the proposed development would considerably alter the roof and rear elevation of the property, with the creation of 'wall dormers' to the upper floor and the creation of a rear extension. The submitted plans show that the alterations would remove the simple character and appearance of the existing property, almost in its entirety.
9. The appellant details that the dormers are designed to reflect those that could be built as "*permitted development on a terraced dwelling*" and that a rear box style dormer has been erected to the rear of one of the properties using permitted development rights. Furthermore, the appellant asserts that other householders could follow suit. However, I have no substantive evidence to suggest that other residents intend to create such dormer extensions.
10. I note that some demolition work has already been carried out at the property and as such the rear elevation is now more simple and less cluttered than it was previously, I have given this matter consideration in reaching my conclusion. Furthermore at the site visit I noted that the rear elevation of the property, while subject to limited visibility from wider public viewpoints would nonetheless be visible from local residential properties and the adjoining road.
11. To conclude this main issue, the appeal scheme would harm the simple visual appearance of the appeal property and thus appear as an incongruous addition harming the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area contrary to Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy

Other Matters

12. I note that the appeal scheme has been changed to respond to previous unsuccessful efforts and comments made by the Council in respect of this application. This does not however convince me as to the acceptability of the appeal scheme.
13. The appeal scheme would, as detailed by the appellant, create 6 dwellings and reuse an otherwise vacant building. These are material considerations that weigh in favour of the appeal, but do not outweigh the harm I have found previously.
14. The appellant suggests that, with regards the proposed stairwell accommodated within the rear extension, "structures of this nature could be constructed utilising the existing permitted development rights of the site". However, the appellant has submitted no substantive evidence to support this and I do not have any evidence before me to suggest that any extension built under existing permitted development rights would have worse effects than the

appeal proposal. As such, I find that this consideration does not outweigh the harm I have identified previously.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr M Brooker

INSPECTOR