



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2025 by S Manson DipTP

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/25/3372347

6 Nab View, Whalley, Clitheroe, Lancashire BB7 9YG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs A Weldon against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 3/2025/0344.
 - The development proposed is described as “regularisation of conversion of garage to home gym and store.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for development described as the “regularisation of conversion of garage to home gym and store” at 6 Nab View, Whalley, Clitheroe, Lancashire BB7 9YG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/2025/0344, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted is as shown on approved plan reference “Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations 2342 – 01”.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on a) the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 8 Nab View (No. 8) with specific regard to noise; and b) highway safety with specific regard to parking.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Living Conditions

4. The appeal relates to a single garage detached from the main dwelling but forming part of a separate building, which includes a residential unit (No. 8) above. The site is located within a housing estate where parking courtyards, garages and bays are predominantly provided to the rear or side of dwellings.
5. The location of No. 8, positioned above two garages and an underpass leading to a rear parking courtyard used by neighbouring properties, naturally introduces a level of ambient noise and activity beyond what might be expected in a more typical residential setting. As a result, the occupiers of No. 8 are accustomed to a certain degree of disturbance, including from vehicle movements and other general courtyard activity.

6. The modest size of the garage naturally limits the scale and intensity of activity. Any noise generated by its use as a home gym is likely to be minimal and intermittent, comparable to typical household activity. The original structure of the building was designed to accommodate garages beneath a separate residential unit, providing a degree of acoustic separation to help mitigate sound transmission. The appellants have implemented further sound insulation measures, which are considered proportionate given the domestic nature and limited scale of the development.
7. While concerns have been raised regarding commercial use, the appeal before me seeks only to regularise the conversion of the garage for private use by the appellant. There is no compelling evidence to suggest that a commercial use is ongoing, nor would one be authorised. Should any future change of use be proposed, it would be subject to a separate planning application and assessment.
8. Consequently, the proposals would not unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 8 with regard to noise. The development therefore accords with Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy 2008 – 2028 A Local Plan for Ribble Valley 2014 (LP) insofar as it requires all development to not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area. The proposal also complies with paragraphs 187 and 198 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), which requires development to not contribute to unacceptable noise pollution.

Highway Safety

9. As a result of the garage conversion, only one off-street parking space remains at the side of the appeal dwelling. However, and in accordance with current parking standards, the garage is no longer considered a viable parking space due to its size. Consequently, the appeal property is already reliant on its existing driveway and available on-street (unallocated) parking to meet its parking needs.
10. During my site visit, there was extensive capacity for parking on neighbouring driveways. This was during the middle of the working day, however, it would suggest that many returning vehicles are likely accommodated off-street, reducing pressure on surrounding roads. There was ample on-street parking locally, where vehicles could sensibly and safely park without impeding the free flow of traffic.
11. The appellant has confirmed that only one vehicle is currently owned and parked on the driveway, separate from the garage. While future circumstances may change, such as the acquisition of an additional vehicle, I am satisfied that any increased parking demand could be accommodated on-street without causing undue harm to highway safety.
12. The proposal would not therefore result in harm to highway safety or unacceptably inhibit the free flow of traffic due to on-street parking. Accordingly, it complies with Policy DMG3 of the LP and the Framework. Both of which seek to ensure that highway safety is secured for the users of new and existing development.

Conditions

13. Since works in pursuant of the appeal have been completed, a time condition is not required. I have set out a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans for enforcement purposes. Regarding the suggested conditions, I have no evidence before me to suggest that such conditions are necessary or

reasonable given that the proposed use clearly states it is for a home gym and not for business or commercial use. Given the scale of development, to require an additional scheme for sound insulation would place an unjustifiable and disproportionate financial burden on the appellant, which would fail the test of reasonableness in light of the considerations outlined above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. The appeal scheme would comply with the development plan for the reasons I have set out and there is nothing to suggest a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend the appeal is allowed.

S Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission granted, subject to the condition set out.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR