



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2021

by Helen B Hockenhull BA (Hons) B.PI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/21/3274789

2 Bridge End, Whalley Road, Billington BB7 9NU

- 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 Helen Johnson against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2021/0167, dated 12 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is internal alterations to create open plan/upside down house with additional mezzanine level. External alterations include new window openings and velux roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the window on the eastern elevation. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the internal alterations to create open plan/upside down house with additional mezzanine level. External alterations include new window opening to the southern elevation and velux roof lights. Accordingly planning permission is granted for internal alterations to create open plan/upside down house with additional mezzanine level. External alterations include new window opening to the southern elevation and velux roof lights at 2 Bridge End, Whalley Road, Billington BB7 9NU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/2021/0167, dated 12 February 2012 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans as far as they relate to the works permitted: Proposed Site Plan - Drawing No. PHA465 A102, Proposed Plans - Drawing No. PHA/465 A104, Proposed Elevations - Drawing No. PHA/465 A202, Proposed Sections - Drawing No. PHA/465 A302, Supporting Visuals - Drawing No. PHA/465 A903
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The original description of development on the submitted application form included a linking walkway to an existing sun terrace. During the consideration of the application, this part of the proposal was removed. I have therefore used

the amended description used in the Council's Decision Notice in the banner heading above and considered the appeal scheme on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the setting of the nearby Grade II listed buildings at 10-18 Terrace Row and Calder Cottage and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Whalley Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property forms a late 19th century two storey end terrace house constructed in sandstone with painted ashlar dressing and a slate roof. It lies in a prominent position with its gable elevation facing east towards Whalley Bridge. It lies within Whalley Conservation Area (CA) and in the setting of nearby Grade II listed buildings. The property is denoted as a Building of Townscape Merit in the CA Appraisal and is of significance as a typical 19th century dwelling forming part of a short terrace row.
5. The CA is notable for its riverside location enclosed by hills on three sides, the ruins of the 13th century Whalley Abbey, the 14th century Parish Church, Whalley Viaduct and other 17th, 18th and 19th century buildings. The CA Appraisal identifies the area around the appeal site as being dominated by the wide sweep of the river with a large weir to the east and the steep incline from the Bridge to the summit of the Nab Hill. It also highlights the open green spaces, groups of trees, views from the Bridge and the notable gothic detailed listed buildings at Nos 10-18 Terrace Row. In so far as it relates to this appeal, I find the significance of the CA to relate to its riverside location, its historic origins and the architectural quality of its buildings constructed in the local vernacular.
6. The appeal scheme proposes both internal and external works to the property. The Council raise no concern with respect to the internal works. I have no reason to disagree. The external works include the removal of the chimney stack, new conservation style rooflights to front, side and rear roof slopes and new first floor windows in the east gable and south elevations.
7. The existing chimney stack is proposed to be removed from the hipped roof and replaced with a conservation rooflight. This would not cause harm to the character or appearance of the host building. There are 2 small projecting rooflights to the northern and southern roof slopes. Their replacement with flush fitting conservation rooflight would be of benefit to the buildings appearance and is therefore to be supported. Both these elements of the proposed works would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. Due to their position, they would also cause no harm to the setting of the nearby heritage assets.
8. The proposed new window in the rear southern elevation, would overlook an existing rear single storey extension. This flat roof extension is of modern appearance and makes little contribution to the character and appearance of the CA. The proposed window would be in keeping with other window openings on this elevation and would not have a negative impact on the character of the building, the CA or the setting of nearby listed buildings.

9. The existing eastern elevation has a balanced appearance with two-ground floor and two first floor windows. The proposed additional first floor window on this elevation, would unbalance the symmetry of these openings and result in a incongruous addition failing to respect the historic character of the building. This eastern gable is particularly prominent facing Moor Lane and being a significant feature in views from Whalley Bridge and the wider CA. The proposed additional window would form a discordant feature causing harm to the character and appearance of the CA and the setting the nearby listed Terrace Row.
10. In summary I have found that the proposed new rooflights and the window on the southern elevation would be acceptable, preserving the character and appearance of the CA and causing no harm to the setting of nearby listed buildings. These works would accord with Policies DMG1, DMH5 and DME4 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy which seek to achieve a high standard of design, safeguard the visual appearance and landscape character of an area and protect heritage assets.
11. However, the proposed window in the eastern elevation would not be acceptable in the above terms and would fail to accord with the aforementioned policies. As the different works proposed are physically and functionally severable, it is open to me to issue a split decision, allowing the rooflights and southern elevation window.

Other matters

12. The appellant has outlined that a positive response was gained to the proposed works when pre application advice was sought. However, the application was refused. It is contended that this represents an unhelpful and inconsistent approach by the Council. This does not form a matter that I can address in this appeal. Whilst I understand the appellant's frustration, pre application advice is given without prejudice to the success or otherwise of a subsequent planning application.

Conditions

13. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I impose a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings, where applicable, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A materials condition is also required to safeguard the character and appearance of the host building and the CA.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail in respect of the window in the eastern elevation but succeed in respect of the internal alterations, velux rooflights and rear window in the southern elevation. A split decision is therefore issued.

Helen Hockenhull

INSPECTOR