

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2021

**by David Fitzsimon MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 9th December 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/21/3277393**

**4 King Henry Mews, Bolton by Bowland, Clitheroe, Lancs BB7 4HR**

- 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 Andrew Burcher against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 3/2021/0208, dated 22 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2021.
  - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its setting.

## Reason

3. The appeal relates to a mid-terrace dwelling. It sits within a row of dwellings created by the conversion of what I understand to have been a former stable block. It sits within a courtyard which enjoys a rural setting and the quality of the landscape is recognised by its designation within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
  4. The proposal seeks to add a single storey extension to the rear elevation of the host dwelling. It would cover about half of the rear elevation at ground floor level and it would project some 4 metres rearwards. Although the extension would be finished in stone under a slate roof, the end gable would be predominantly glazed whilst a large set of bi-folding doors would dominate the south-west side elevation. This design approach would give the extension a very modern and domestic appearance.
  5. In my experience, most if not all schemes involving the residential conversion of a rural building introduce some domestic features including windows and doors, rooflights and domestic boundary treatments; whilst an array of domestic paraphernalia is often subsequently found within the private amenity areas. This is the case with this conversion scheme, with new openings, chimneys and conservation style rooflights added. Nevertheless, the conversion appears to
-

have been undertaken in a broadly sympathetic manner and the origins of the building remain clear.

6. To my mind, the extent of rearward projection and the modern design of the proposed extension, which includes the extensive use of glazing, would not respond well to the lateral form, traditional detailing and proportions of the original building. I note that the extension would be partially screened by the tall boundary walls which provide privacy to the patio areas of some of the dwellings within the row. Nevertheless, it would be readily visible from the open land to the south, from where it would be viewed as an overly prominent and unsympathetic addition.
7. Policy DMH5 of the adopted Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008-2028 (CS) allows for domestic extensions which are capable of being integrated into the main dwelling and comply with policy DMG1. This policy requires development to be of a high quality design that considers its context. The Council argues that policy DMH4 of the CS, which relates to residential conversions, is relevant. This policy explains that conversion of barns and other buildings to dwellings will only be permitted if the buildings are structurally sound and capable of conversion for the proposed use without the need for extensive building or major alteration and they are of a sufficient size to provide necessary living accommodation without the need for further extensions which would harm the character and appearance of the building. However, I understand the conversion scheme took place in 1992 or thereabouts and predates this policy.
8. The Appellant asserts that a historical map from 1909 shows a range of minor additions along the rear of the former stable block, forming part of a cluster of buildings. However, these buildings are no longer present and no details relating to their appearance have been provided to me. On this basis, it is not possible to assess with any degree of accuracy whether or not the historical significance of the rear elevation of the building has been diminished by their absence. In any event, this factor does not justify the introduction of a structure which would not respond well to the form and character of the building as it stands today.
9. The Appellant also refers to an extension which has been added to No. 1 King Henry Mews. Whilst I do not know the precise planning circumstances behind this addition, its size and shape is very different to the proposal before me and therefore is not directly comparable.
10. For the above reasons, and despite an absence of any formal objections from nearby residents, I conclude that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its setting within the AONB. In such terms, it conflicts with policies DMG, DMH5 and Key Statement EN2 of the CS, which promote high quality design that considers its context.
11. The arguments advanced by the Appellant do not outweigh this harm and policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

*David Fitzsimon*

INSPECTOR