



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 May 2012

by K Sheffield BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 May 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/12/2172918

**Houghton Farm Cottage, Osbaldeston Lane, Osbaldeston, Blackburn,
BB2 7LY**

- 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 Mrs Sarah Roundell against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2011/0851 was refused by notice dated 19 January 2012.
 - The development proposed is a rear second floor extension and detached single garage to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on the western side of Osbaldeston Lane and lies within a cluster of properties in open countryside. The appeal property is an end of terrace and there is another terrace to the north of the access track which marks the northern boundary of the site. There are further properties on the eastern side of Osbaldeston Lane. The existing property is two storey with a single storey element to the rear which is encompassed under a cat slide roof. It is above this section of the property that the extension would be added. The proposed garage would be sited within the garden, a little distance from the house. No objections to this element of the proposals have been raised by the Council and I have no reason to reach a different conclusion.
4. The proposed extension would reflect the dimensions of the existing single storey section of the property and the ridge height would match that of the existing roof. It is accepted that the proposed use of stone and slate materials would complement the existing dwelling, and the proposed fenestration would not be out of keeping. However, the proposed increase in the height of the walls of the extension over the existing dwelling and the resultant difference in eaves height would create a poor visual relationship between the existing dwelling and the extension. This leads me to conclude that the scale and design of the extension would result in a dominant and incongruous feature to the detriment of the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

5. Although the extension would be to the rear of the dwelling and therefore views of it would be limited, it would be seen from the access track and from the public footpath to the south of the site. The neighbouring properties in the terrace display similar characteristics to the appeal site and none have a first floor over the rear single storey element. Although the introduction of a first floor would not necessarily harm the overall character of the terrace, for the reasons already identified it is considered that the proposed extension would harm the terrace and the surroundings of the site generally.
6. It is acknowledged that other properties in the area have been extended and I noted the storage facility referred to by the appellant. However, no details of these developments have been submitted and I am therefore unable to draw any direct comparison between them and the case before me. Nevertheless I did observe during my site visit the extensions to the rear of the properties in the terrace to the north of the appeal site which are similar in design to the appeal scheme. However, the relationship between those extensions and the main dwellings do not display the difference in height at eaves level shown in the appeal proposal.
7. It is therefore concluded that the proposed extension would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its surroundings, contrary to saved Policies G1, ENV3, and H10 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan, 1998 (LP) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings, 2000 which seek a high quality design.
8. In its reason for refusing planning permission the Council also cited Policy H17 of the LP which refers to the conversion of buildings. There is dispute between the parties as to whether the property was built as a residential or agricultural building. It is evident from the planning history submitted by the Council that in 1979¹ part of the terrace was in use as a cowshed and barn. However, the drawings which accompanied the reserved matters application² indicate these elements to be within the central section of the terrace and include the large opening still present in the front elevation.
9. In addition the sales details submitted by the appellant, which are dated 1979, refer to two cottages one with a slate roof and one with flag roof. The appeal property is the only one within the terrace which fits that description of a slate roof as the remainder of the terrace has a flag roof. The later applications referred to by the Council shed no further light on the matter. Therefore, on the evidence before me it would appear highly probable that the appeal property was not previously used as a cowshed and barn and on this basis I have had no regard to Policy H17 of the LP in reaching my decision. Nevertheless this does not alter my conclusion in respect of the development.
10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

K. Sheffield

INSPECTOR

¹ Application Refs: 3/79/0096/P and 3/79/0097/P

² Application ref: 3/79/1270/PB