



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2012

by Keith Turner LLB(Hons) DipArch(Dist) RIBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 28 August 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/12/2176542

74 Knowsley Road, Wilpshire, Lancashire, BB1 9PN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Ian Scholey against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
- The application Ref 3/2012/0160 was refused by notice dated 4 May 2012.
- The development proposed is proposed two storey side extension incorporating kitchen, lounge, two further bedrooms and house bathroom. Single storey rear extension to include downstairs cloaks and utility room. Existing shippon to be demolished.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The appeal must be determined in accordance with the provisions of the development plan and having regard to all other material considerations. The development plan in this instance comprises the saved policies in the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan 1998. The appeal development comprises a residential extension and Policy H10 relates directly to such proposals. It indicates that they should be considered on the basis of the scale, design and massing in relation to the surrounding area. They must also be in conformity with Policy G1.
3. The Council, in determining the application, indicated that they considered the appeal premises, together with the others in the terrace, to be of historic interest. This is because of the random stone faced north and east elevations and the presence of the shippon, all of which relate back to the building's agricultural origins. I agree that the appeal property remains the least altered in the terrace and retains simplicity of form which is attractive in its own right. However, as the Appellant has indicated, the remainder of the properties in the terrace have been substantially altered. Those alterations include remodelling of the front façade, the addition of bay windows and canopies, replacement of traditional forms of window, and major extensions to the rear. Taken cumulatively I consider those alterations have largely subsumed much of the historic interest that the terrace may have possessed as a whole.
4. The appeal premises are not a listed building and they do not lie within a conservation area or on land with any other similar designation. They cannot be regarded, therefore, as a designated heritage asset in the terms set out in

the recently published Framework¹. Consequently their significance is limited to being a heritage asset which is defined in Annex 2, as a building having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions because of its heritage interest. Having regard to the matters referred to above, I consider that significance to be limited.

5. Notwithstanding that conclusion, any extension to a dwelling ought to have regard to the Council's published supplementary planning guidance² which is directly relevant in this instance. In paragraph 5.2 it states that any extension should reflect the character of the original house and the wider locality. The Appellant points out that the design mirrors the primary form of the existing building and some elements such as the front windows would have similar proportions. However, the primary issue, in my judgement, is the matter of scale. The Council's guidance requires, as a general rule, that any extension should not dominate the original house. This reflects good design practice in my professional experience.
6. The proposed extensions would effectively double the width of the frontage over both storeys, the lean-to addition to the rear would subsume the main façade on the ground floor, and the proposed porch would introduce a discordant element on to what is currently a simple façade. Similarly, the proposed external chimney would represent a departure from the present simplicity of the building. Whilst some similar features are to be found on neighbouring dwellings in the terrace, that fact alone cannot not justify alterations which conflict with planning policy and represent design of questionable quality.
7. The sheer size and extent of the proposed additions would subsume the traditional character of the building which gives it and its surroundings a sense of place and historical continuity. In addition, the design of some windows and doors would not reflect the form and proportions of the building and this too would subsume its character and detract from its visual contribution to the surroundings.
8. I find that the proposed development would not accord with the objectives of Policy H10 of the Local Plan, or with the specific advice contained in the Council's supplementary planning guidance. Furthermore, it would not promote or reinforce local distinctiveness which, according to Paragraph 60 of the Framework, is a proper objective and one which, in this instance, is relevant given that the appeal building does still possess some limited historic interest and associations. In the absence of any material considerations which indicate otherwise the appeal fails.

K Turner

INSPECTOR

¹ National Planning Policy Framework – April 2012

² Planning Policy Note and Design Guidance: Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings, adopted September 2000