



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2026

by E Fawcett BA (Jt Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6005832

Woodfold Park Stud, Woodfold Park, Mellor, Lancashire BB2 7QA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Chris Ellison against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 3/2025/0899.
 - The development proposed is rear single-storey extension to detached dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Chris Ellison against Ribble Valley Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), development is permitted for the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse, subject to limitations and conditions. For larger extensions, exceeding the limits in paragraph A.1(f), but allowed by paragraph A.1(g), the developer must provide information relating to the proposal to the local planning authority (LPA). The LPA may refuse an application where the proposed development does not comply with the conditions, limitations or restrictions applicable to development permitted by Class A.
4. Clarification was sought from both parties regarding which plans were considered by the Council when they made their decision. The responses confirm that the amended elevation and roof plans¹ were requested by the Council during the consideration of the application. Whilst the proposed plans include a 2-storey extension, I noted on my site visit that this had not been constructed. I have therefore determined the appeal based on the amended plans, but only insofar as they relate to the appeal proposal for a single storey extension.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would be permitted development under Class A.

¹ Drawing Nos. BB355-110-Jb and BB355-104Fb.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a large, detached 2-storey dwelling with a stepped rear elevation. The proposal relates to the erection of a single storey extension to the rear of the building. The submitted plans and application form show that the extension would project up to 8 metres beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse, broadly following the staggered arrangement of the existing rear elevation.
7. The limitations set out in paragraphs A.1(g) and A.1(j) respectively refer to the 'rear wall' and 'side elevation' of the original dwellinghouse. The Government's Technical Guidance² assists in the interpretation of these terms and includes diagrams illustrating the relevant terminology and the circumstances in which householder development would, or would not, be permitted by the GPDO. Whilst the Technical Guidance is not a statutory instrument, it is material as an aid to the interpretation and application of the GPDO.
8. Paragraph A.1(j)(iii) of the GPDO states that, where the enlargement would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation, it is not permitted development if its width would exceed half the width of the original dwellinghouse. The Technical Guidance explains that any wall that cannot be identified as a front or rear wall should be regarded as forming a side elevation, and this can be more than 2 walls. The diagram on page 22 illustrates this approach. As the appeal property has a stepped rear elevation, it has several clearly identifiable side elevations.
9. The Technical Guidance makes clear that where an extension is beyond any side wall, the restrictions in paragraph A.1(j) apply. The diagrams on page 26 show that, when assessing compliance with the width limitation, the width of the extension is taken as a whole and not merely the part that projects beyond the side wall. Although these diagrams do not depict a stepped rear elevation, such as that found at the appeal property, the principles they illustrate can nevertheless be applied in this case when read alongside the earlier guidance defining side walls.
10. Applying paragraph A.1(j)(iii) of the GPDO, and having regard to the interpretation set out in the Technical Guidance, the proposed extension would project beyond a number of side walls created by the stepped rear elevation, and its width would exceed half the width of the original dwellinghouse. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with this limitation and would not constitute permitted development.
11. Paragraph A.1(g)(i) states that, to be permitted development, a single storey extension must not extend more than 8 metres beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse. The Technical Guidance confirms that this measurement should be taken from the base of the rear wall of the original house. Measured in this way, the proposed extension would not exceed the 8-metre limitation and would therefore comply with paragraph A.1(g)(i).
12. I conclude that, although the proposal would comply with paragraph A.1(g)(i), it would fail to satisfy the requirements of paragraph A.1(j)(iii) and would therefore not be permitted development under Class A.

² Ministry of Housing, Communities Local Government, Permitted development rights for householders: Technical Guidance (2019).

Other Matters

13. A previous appeal relating to an application for a Lawful Development Certificate³ for rear extensions at the appeal property was allowed. However, the issue in dispute in that case was whether the proposed extensions would be situated within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse. The appeal decision states that there was no disagreement between the parties regarding any of the size or other limitations or conditions of Class A of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the GPDO, and those matters were therefore not considered further. Accordingly, that decision does not alter my conclusions in the present appeal, where compliance with the limitations of Class A is the principal matter in dispute.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

E Fawcett

INSPECTOR

³ APP/T2350/X/24/3340642