



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2013

by Anne Jordan BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 25 July 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/13/2199040

Slimrow, Slaidburn Road, Newton in Bowland, Clitheroe, BB7 3DL

- 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 & Mrs Bamford against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2013/0321, dated 18 March 2013, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2013.
 - The development proposed is construction of single storey side extension to provide improved living and bedroom space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, which is within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Planning Policy

3. The Council have put forward policies from both the *Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan (Adopted June 1998)* (Local Plan) and the emerging *Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008-2028 (Regulation 22 Submission Draft)* (Core Strategy). The Core Strategy is at present under examination and I cannot as such be sure that the policies from it will be adopted in their current form. Therefore whilst the policies put to me appear to be broadly consistent with those put forward from the Local Plan, I give them limited weight.
4. Local Plan saved policies G1 and H10 set out the principles for the design, layout and appearance of residential development including extensions. Policy ENV1 relates to the protection and conservation of the landscape and character of the AONB. None of these policies conflict with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) and I therefore give them due weight.
5. I have also been referred to the guidance contained within *Supplementary Planning Guidance - Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings* (SPG) which contains advice on the design of domestic extensions.

Reasons

6. Slimrow is a detached dwelling located within open countryside in the Forest of Bowland. The property sits within a substantial curtilage which includes a number of outbuildings. Information accompanying the application indicates that the property was created following a fire and involved the conversion of an existing farmhouse and outbuildings. It has subsequently been extended. The resulting building is an attractive dwelling and the use of natural stone, the limited openings and the catslide roof to the front elevation all lend the building a traditional appearance appropriate to its rural context. The building sits comfortably in the landscape and is not an intrusive feature when viewed from the public footpath that crosses the property.
7. The property is adjoined to one side by a level grassed area and it is here that the single storey extension is proposed. It would cover a substantial footprint of around 10.6 metres long and 8.5 metres deep which would significantly extend the footprint of the existing property. Despite being relatively low, the length and depth of the proposal would lead to an extension of considerable mass which would compete in scale with the main dwelling. The resulting roof would also have a relatively shallow pitch which would be inconsistent with that on the main dwelling and this along with the number of windows required to serve a domestic addition of the scale proposed would emphasise the depth of the proposal. As a result of its disproportionate size the extension would appear incongruous and suburban in form, and would be at odds with the traditional form of the rest of the building.
8. The property is not visible from the road and due to the lie of the land and the drystone wall that surrounds the rear of the site only the upper floor of the property is apparent in the wider landscape. Nevertheless, the proposal would sit immediately adjacent to the public footpath which crosses the property and would be prominent in views from it. Whilst I note that the appellant considers the footpath not to be well used, it does nonetheless provide a public view of the site from which the visual impact of the proposal would be evident, and this adds to the harm identified above. Therefore, notwithstanding the limited views of the proposal in the wider landscape, it would fail to conserve or enhance the landscape and character of the Forest of Bowland AONB.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling within the Forest of Bowland AONB. It follows that it would conflict with the requirements of policies G1 and H10 of the Local Plan which seek to provide development which is sympathetic in terms of size and appropriate in terms of scale, design and massing. This reflects guidance contained within the SPG. The proposal would also conflict with policy ENV1 which seeks to ensure that the scale and massing of development within the AONB conserves the natural beauty of the area. This is also consistent with guidance contained within the Framework, which seeks to secure a high quality of design for all new development and gives great weight to conserving landscape within AONBs.
10. The Council have also put forward policies H15, H16 and H17 of the Local Plan. As the proposal does not propose conversion of an existing building, these would appear to have limited relevance to this case.
11. I note the comments of the appellant, that a larger building originally stood on the site, and that the proposal would provide a more enclosed building form

which would echo the form of an agricultural building and restore the unity of the original farm complex. For the reasons outlined above, the form of the building proposed would not provide any visual benefit. I also note the appellant's reference to guidance within the SPG in relation to the scale of domestic additions. These guidelines are not intended to be prescriptive and in any case do not alter the visual harm the proposal would give rise to. Finally, I also note that the proposal would provide additional accommodation for the appellant, but this benefit would not outweigh the harm identified above.

12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR