



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2026

by **David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 January 2026

---

### Appeal Ref: 6001181

### Clementina, Barker Lane, Mellor, BB2 7EE

- 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 & Mrs Vary against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 3/2025/0275.
  - The development proposed is conservatory to side (southeast) elevation.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conservatory to side (southeast) elevation at Clementina, Barker Lane, Mellor, BB2 7EE in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 3/2025/0275, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with: Location Plan PP-13909126v1; Block Plan; Proposed Elevations; and Proposed Ground Floor Layout & Roof Plan.
  - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on the Proposed Elevations and Proposed Ground Floor Layout & Roof Plan.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, with due regard to the openness of the Green Belt.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that new buildings within the Green Belt are inappropriate subject to a number of exceptions. Paragraph 154(c) of the Framework sets out that one of these exceptions is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
4. The appeal site consists of a bungalow which has been extended in the past. There is no specific definition in the Framework or the Council's development plan as to what constitutes a 'disproportionate' extension. The Council has referred to previous extensions and states that these extensions as well as the appeal proposal would represent a 60% increase in cubic volume. I am mindful that even

a small extension could represent a disproportionate addition when considered cumulatively with previous development.

5. However, the assessment of the size of the proposal compared to the original building is not purely a mathematical exercise. Although the dwelling has previously been extended, based on what I have seen and read the extensions are well-related to the original building and do not appear as overly bulky additions. The proposed conservatory would also be of limited bulk, and when combined with the previous extensions it would not result in sprawling development around the original building. Considered objectively and in context, the proposed conservatory would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The proposal would therefore not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt within the terms of Paragraph 154(c) of the Framework.
6. Key Statement EN1 of the Council's Core Strategy 2014 limits new buildings in the Green Belt to those relating to specific purposes, and the proposed conservatory would not fall into one of the identified categories. However, the wording of Key Statement EN1 is inconsistent with the Framework, and on that basis the conflict with Key Statement EN1 does not lead me to a different conclusion in respect of the proposal being not inappropriate.
7. Key Statement EN1 also refers to the effect on openness. However, the appeal site is located within a cluster of built development, and the proposed conservatory is of a very limited scale. Therefore, although the proposal would introduce new built development into the Green Belt, when considered spatially and visually the effect on openness will be minimal. Furthermore, Paragraph 154(c) of the Framework does not require that the effect on openness is assessed in respect of extensions to a building. Given that the development is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt within the terms of the Framework, it would also not conflict with the purposes of designation.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposal would conflict with Key Statement EN1 of the Core Strategy in that it does not fall within one of the stated forms of development and would also lead to some harm to openness, albeit to a minimal degree. However, the proposal would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building, and would therefore not be inappropriate development in the Green belt within the terms of paragraph 154(c) of the Framework. On that basis, there are material considerations that indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.
9. The Council has not provided a list of suggested conditions. However, I am mindful of the conditions typically placed on development of the type proposed. In addition to the standard 3 year time limitation for commencement, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans in the interests of certainty. A condition in relation to materials is appropriate in respect of character and appearance.
10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

*David Cross*      INSPECTOR