



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2021

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/W/21/3275319

The Rann, Saccary Lane, Mellor, Blackburn BB1 9DL

- 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 Finlay Hodge against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2021/0084, dated 25 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is the Demolition of existing garage. Extension and alterations to change the use of domestic store to a dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in July 2021. This has replaced the 2019 iteration. The main parties were given the opportunity to comment upon the implications of the revised Framework.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within the open countryside. It includes a single storey garage and a detached store. The store has a modest and functional agricultural appearance, created in part by its simple form and the predominant use of stone with lack of openings. The appeal buildings form a cluster of built form with the adjacent property and outbuildings, which are of similar character.
5. Despite its set-down ridgeline, the proposed two storey rear extension would nevertheless have a substantial overall height and footprint. It would therefore introduce considerable massing and appear overly bulky, thus significantly altering the form and appearance of the original building.
6. The extensive use of glazing on the extension's north elevation would also appear at odds with the building's high stone to void ratio which contributes significantly to its modest appearance. The scale of the extension combined with the substantial introduction of glazing would considerably detract from and be unsympathetic to the simple agricultural characteristics of the built form and it would be visually incongruous within this rural locality.

7. I note that the previously approved extension to the host building was single storey in scale. Therefore, despite the use of glazing in that example, it is not directly comparable to the development before me and does not therefore serve to justify the appeal proposal. I am also unconvinced that satisfactory living conditions cannot be achieved without the proposed extensive use of uncharacteristic glazing.
8. Taking all the above into consideration, this proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area and would conflict with Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1, DMH3 and DMH4 of the Core Strategy 2008-2028, A Local Plan for Ribble Valley, Adoption Version. Collectively, these policies seek to ensure that developments are appropriate to their surroundings and reflect local distinctiveness in terms of scale, style and materials, amongst other things.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no relevant material considerations that outweigh this conflict. Therefore, and for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

H Ellison
INSPECTOR