



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2025

**by J D Clark BA (Hons) DpTRP MCD DMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 March 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/24/3350282**

**6 Loach Field Close, Hurst Green, Lancashire BB7 9ZF**

- 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 John Clarke against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 3/2024/0238.
  - The development proposed is two-storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matter

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in December 2024 and is a material consideration in this appeal. Having considered the revisions to the Framework, as well as the principles of natural justice, together with the nature of the determining issues in this appeal it is clear to me that there are no material changes in the revised Framework relevant to the substance of this appeal. Therefore, I do not consider it necessary, in this instance, to invite any submissions from the parties on the revised Framework.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the parent property and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a detached house and its garden on a relatively recently constructed housing development. The house has already been extended, with planning permission, with a single storey rear extension together with an extension to the rear of the garage and dormer windows to the front and rear of the garage.
5. The existing garage is set back from the front of the house and although including accommodation in the roof space is lower than the main house. The proposal would add an additional garage and provide an en-suite bathroom and dressing room to the bedroom above the existing garage. Although the proposal is described as a two storey extension, it would be of a similar height to the existing garage with their ridge heights being no higher than the eaves of the parent house.
6. Notwithstanding the set-back from the front of the house and the lower ridge height, the resulting triple garage with accommodation above would elongate the appearance of the house. This would make the garages, taken collectively, appear

disproportionate to the form, scale and overall appearance of the house. Furthermore, although the existing single storey extension is to the rear of the house, the cumulative impact of the extensions, previous and proposed, erodes the original design and proportions of the house.

7. Due to the position of the house at the head of Leach Field Close, it is very prominent especially when viewed from the south. The appeal site also falls within the Forest of Bowland National Landscape<sup>1</sup> and although part of a residential development, it is set within a backdrop of open countryside. The housing development is attractively designed in terms of the appearance of the dwellings, their spacing and materials giving a generally well proportioned cohesiveness. The proposal, however, would result in additions to No 6 that cumulatively would be incongruous and undermine its design. This would have a negative effect on the wider area.
8. Consequently, the proposed extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the parent property and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Core Strategy<sup>2</sup> Key Statement EN2 and Policy DMG1, which, amongst other things, seek to protect the landscape and character of those areas that contribute to the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and require development to be of a high standard of design, taking into account its impact on visual appearance and its relationship to its surrounding. Also, the proposal would be inconsistent with the aims of the Framework in terms of achieving well designed places and requiring development to be sympathetic to the surrounding built environment and its landscape setting<sup>3</sup>.

## Conclusion

9. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

*J D Clark*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Formerly known as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

<sup>2</sup> Ribble Valley Borough Council – Core Strategy 2008 – 2028 A Local Plan for Ribble Valley Adopted Version, Adopted 16 December 2014.

<sup>3</sup> Paragraph 135.