
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 March 2018

by Gareth Wildgoose BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th April 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/17/3192227

13 Glen Avenue, Ribchester PR3 2ZQ

- 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 T & A Baker against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2017/0741, dated 6 August 2017, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2017.
 - The development proposed is a "*single storey conservatory extension to side*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development provided by the application form has been updated in subsequent documents. The description of development provided in the applicant's appeal form is accurate and precise in terms of the development before me and I adopt it accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect upon the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end terraced dwelling facing Glen Avenue that consists of stone walls and a traditional side gable roof design with chimney. The established form, materials and features of the two storey building, including the windows and coherent surrounds on each elevation, make a positive contribution to its rural character within the countryside setting.
5. The dwelling is in an elevated position when approaching the site from a nearby public footpath (Footpath 12). As a consequence, prominent views of the upper sections of the front and side elevation of No 13 are experienced from some vantage points along the public footpath despite the intervening presence of a steeply sloped embankment and some trees. A variety of detached buildings beyond the private driveway of No 13, including a garage and stable block, are not as influential upon views from the public footpath due to the changes in land levels and their set back position.
6. Having regard to the above, the addition of a single storey side extension consisting of a wood effect frame with considerable glazing to its walls and roof

would introduce an overtly modern addition to the property and the end of the terraced row. When viewed from some vantage points on the public footpath, the side extension would be a prominent and dominant feature adjoining an existing first floor window with an incompatible and incongruous design that would harmfully detract from the traditional character and appearance of the end terraced property. I, therefore, consider that the single storey side extension as proposed would significantly harm the character of the host property and the area in a countryside location.

7. In reaching the above findings, I have taken into account that the property is not a heritage asset, that the extension would not be visible from the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and that the screening afforded by intervening trees would increase during Summer months. Furthermore, the siting of the extension would prevent any impact upon the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties. However, those matters do not mitigate or override the harm that I have identified. In addition, the absence of concern with respect to flood risk, drainage, trees, ecology and the existing access arrangements of the driveway and footpath are neutral factors.
8. The appellant has indicated that other similarly glazed extensions are present in the surrounding area. However, specific locations of the examples were not provided and I am not aware of the circumstances of each case. I, therefore, cannot be certain that any existing glazed extensions replicate the circumstances of the proposal before me or the harm that I have identified. During my visit, I observed that conservatory extensions visible on Glen Avenue are in a minority, with different designs and reduced prominence from public vantage points. I, therefore, necessarily have considered the proposal upon its own merits.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host building and the area. The proposal, therefore, conflicts with Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008 - 2028 - A Local Plan for Ribble Valley, adopted December 2014. When taken together, the policies, amongst other things, seek that all new development must be of a high standard of building design and be sympathetic in terms of scale, massing, style, features and building materials. The policies are consistent with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and its intention that the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside is recognised.

Conclusion

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

Gareth Wildgoose

INSPECTOR