

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2015

**by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 6 November 2015**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/15/3133444**

**The Holly, Wardsley Road, Chipping, Lancashire PR3 2QT**

- 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 Potter against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 3/2015/0318, dated 2 April 2015, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2015.
  - The development proposed is a roof extension above garages to form live-in carer space.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site lies in open countryside within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) states that in such areas great weight should be given to conserving the landscape and natural beauty. Policy EN2 of the *Ribble Valley Core Strategy (adopted December 2014)* (RBCS) seeks to protect, conserve and enhance the landscape and character of the AONB. It indicates that development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape, reflecting local distinctiveness, vernacular style, scale, style, features and building materials.
4. The appeal site consists of a converted barn and a detached triple garage set in extensive grounds. Both the house and the garage are located close to the adjacent road and are clearly visible from it. The northern elevation of the buildings, and particularly the roofs can be seen intermittently when approaching on the road from Chipping, through gaps within the roadside hedge.
5. The surrounding undulating countryside is sparsely settled, with scattered farmsteads and isolated houses. I observed that whilst many of the farms and houses had outbuildings, these buildings were clearly subordinate to the

- dwellings, either by way of their scale or their function. This is the case with the current garage on the appeal site.
6. The proposal would significantly increase the scale and the mass of the garage. In addition, the development would involve the insertion of windows on both roof planes and the gable elevations. As a result, the garage building would no longer appear as a subservient building to the main dwelling in either its scale or its appearance, but would compete with it and detract from its setting. It would therefore appear out of keeping and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.
  7. In particular, as dormer windows are not a feature on buildings in the locality, the three proposed on the northern roof plane would be incongruous and alien features that would not respect the distinctive character of the area. I appreciate that these would be on the roof plane that faces into the site but as noted above this can be seen in places from the public realm, and the proposed increase in height would increase this visibility. In such views they would heighten the prominence of the outbuilding, and appear as a discordant element in the landscape.
  8. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would not accord with the aims of conserving the natural beauty of the AONB. As a result, I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the AONB and would be contrary to Policy EN2 of the RVCS. It would also conflict with Policy DMG1 of the RVCS which, amongst other things, requires new development to have a high standard of design that respect the appearance and character of the surrounding area.
  9. The appellant has provided medical evidence to show the need for accommodation for a live-in carer for his wife. I appreciate the reasons put forward for the proposal which would enable his wife to receive the care she needs whilst remaining in the family home and maintaining her quality of life. However, I am not persuaded that the proposal represents the only way the garage building could be converted to provide the necessary accommodation for a carer. In any event personal circumstances seldom outweigh more general planning considerations, and it is likely that the proposal would remain long after the current personal circumstances cease to be material.
  10. I note that in the past permission was granted for a helicopter building and swimming pool on the site but these were not implemented. The appellant has highlighted that these would have been far more substantial than the current proposal. However, I do not have the full details of the circumstances that led to these proposals being considered acceptable, and in particular the policy framework that applied at the time. In any case I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
  11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

*Alison Partington*

INSPECTOR