



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2023

**by John Whalley**

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

**Decision date: 26<sup>th</sup> June 2023**

**Appeal ref: APP/T2350/D/22/3313818**

**1 Park Road, Gisburn, Lancashire BB7 4HT**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for development carried out without planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Paul Hargreaves/Green Planet Energy against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
- The application, ref. 3/2022/0440 dated 3 May 2022, was refused by a notice dated 4 October 2022.
- The development proposed is the retention of garden room/home office and garden shed.

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed. Planning permission is refused.

### **Main issue**

2. The main issue is the effect of the garden room/home office and garden shed upon the setting of listed buildings, the character and appearance of Gisburn Conservation Area and the setting of Gisburne Park historic park.

### **Reasons**

3. The appeal application seeks planning permission for the retention of 2 flat roofed outbuildings in and near the end of the side garden of 1 Park Road. The garden room/office building is 7m long, 3m wide. The smaller store appeal building covers 3m x 3m. Each building is 2.4m high clad with horizontal timber boards. Both have deep black plastic facias and vertical corner edging.
4. An earlier planning appeal decision, (our ref: APP/T2350/D/21/3282794), issued on 22 November 2021 in respect of the 2 outbuildings refused permission for their retention. The Inspector in that case was most troubled by the black roof edging and corner detailing. He considered those embellishments to be cumbersome and visually harmful, giving the buildings an unnecessary dominance.
5. The Appellant, Mr Hargreaves, sought to address those concerns by suggesting the removal of the black edging to the roof eaves and corners and applying stone coloured rendering to the north and east elevations of the 2 outbuildings. He said that would simplify the design and reduce their visual impact. The works would minimise any visual harm to the setting of the adjacent Grade II

listed building and the Gisburn Conservation Area. Planting and landscaping would also be used to soften the visual impact on the street scene. The revisions might not result in a positive contribution or enhancement to the Conservation Area. But that neutral effect would preserve its character and appearance.

6. Whilst having regard to the views of the Inspector dealing with the previous appeal decision of November 2021, I am not bound by his conclusions. I do agree, however, with his opinion that the black roof and corner edging to the appeal outbuildings is particularly unsightly. If his decision could be taken to imply that removal of the edging might also remove any residual objections to the retention of the buildings, that is not a view I share.
7. I consider the appeal outbuildings to have materially harmed the appearance of this western part of the Gisburn Conservation Area, where Park Road is described in the Conservation Area appraisal as "another haven of gentility dating from the creation of Gisburne Park in the early 18th century.". The Grade II listed No. 1 Park Road is described as being early 19th, rubble with sandstone dressings and sandstone roof, two-story bay window with gutter of lead-lined stone, sashes and gutter on brackets. The nearby presence of other listed buildings and focal buildings of townscape merit adds to the need to apply particularly careful protection in this location.
8. The larger appeal outbuilding stands prominently above Park Road, somewhat emphasising its incongruity within the garden of the house at No. 1. When seen from Park Road and down Park Mews from the A59 trunk road, the 2 flat roofed timber clad appeal outbuildings appear unhappily obtrusive and ill-fitting. That is especially so when contrasted with the pitched stone and slate roofs of nearby long-established buildings.
9. I conclude that the 2 appeal outbuildings fail the test of meeting the duty under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended, that .... with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, ..... special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area, (s.71A of the Act) and that planning permission for their retention should be withheld. No planning conditions could be applied such as to override that decision.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons outlined above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.



INSPECTOR