



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 August 2012

by J D Westbrook BSc(hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 September 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/A/12/2175729

1 Portfield Bar, Whalley, Clitheroe, BB7 9DL

- 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 Ms Pamela Oliver against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2011/1001, dated 22 November 2011, was refused by notice dated 17 April 2012.
 - The development proposed is a new detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is whether the proposed dwelling represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt and, if so, whether the harm to the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by any other considerations

Reasons

3. No 1 Portfield Bar is a detached house at the northern end of a short row of dwellings, located a little south of the junction of Accrington Road and Burnley Road. It lies within the Green Belt in open countryside to the south east of Whalley. The proposed dwelling would occupy the current side garden area to the north of the house and would necessitate the removal of an existing car port.
 4. Paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) indicates that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt, subject to certain exceptions. The current proposal does not constitute such an exception and it is therefore inappropriate development which, by definition, is harmful to the Green Belt. In line with advice in the NPPF, I afford this harm substantial weight.
 5. The appellant contends that the house would be on an existing residential garden plot and would necessitate the demolition of an existing car port. However, the dwelling would be substantially larger than the car port and
-

would extend significantly further away from the existing house. On this basis, and since the proposed dwelling would extend the existing small row of houses, it would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt.

6. The proposed dwelling would be separated from the existing house by a gap of only 1.5 metres. This would be uncharacteristic of the small row of houses of which it is a part, where there are significantly larger gaps, at least at first floor level. It would, therefore, be harmful to the visual amenities of the area.
7. In conclusion, I find that the considerations put forward by the appellant do not clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to the visual amenities of the area that would be caused by the proposal, and that there are, therefore, no very special circumstances to justify this inappropriate development. The proposed dwelling would also conflict with policy ENV4 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan, which relates to development in the Green Belt and which conforms to the main thrust of advice in the NPPF.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR