



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 December 2015

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 31 December 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/15/3138149

19 Whalley Road, Sabden, Lancashire BB7 9DZ

- 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 P Marcroft against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2015/0711, dated 21 August 2015, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2015.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 19 Whalley Road, Sabden, Lancashire in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/2015/0711, dated 21 August 2015, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 15-0962-1, 2, 3A, 4, 5 and 8.
 - 3) The materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

3. The property lies within Sabden Conservation Area which the *Conservation Area Appraisal* describes as being characterised by late 18th and 19th century terraced houses which were built as homes for Sabden's mill workers. They represent the most prevalent building type. This property lies near to the centre of the village and between and opposite such terraces.
 4. The proposal would result in the addition of a small rear extension to the property. The Council consider that this would be incongruous, conspicuous
-

- and unsympathetic to the building, which itself is significant for its retention of its original form and detail.
5. The extension would not be visible from the street and would have no impact on the street scene. There are long views of the village from a path to the north, although these views are not identified as being important by the *Appraisal*. The rear of this property is visible intermittently and the unusual form of its main roof and angled eaves can be viewed. The roof of the existing rear addition can also be made out but given the falling ground and its limited size, it is not at all prominent.
 6. The extension would be set alongside the existing rear ground floor element and would be viewed against the two storey rear of the property. In these long views, the many rear additions to the terraced properties, that form the edge of the settlement, are apparent but have little significance. The addition proposed would similarly have very little prominence. The distinctive roof of this property would not be altered and given the scale and the matching materials of this small extension, although its roof would be visible in some long views, it would make no perceptible difference to the appearance or character of the village. I find no support for the Council's suggestion that it would be incongruous or conspicuous.
 7. The Council have made reference to this property being of historic significance. It is identified as a building of townscape merit on the conservation area map but this designation similarly relates to all of the neighbouring terraces in the vicinity. An important view between this property and its neighbour is identified but this would not be altered by the proposal.
 8. It has not been suggested within any of the documentation before me that the building represents a non-designated heritage asset as defined by the *National Planning Policy Framework*. The appellant makes reference to the Council referring to a heritage asset but I believe that the Council's references relate to the designated heritage asset which is the conservation area. The list of elements within the *Appraisal*, that make up the special interest of the conservation area, do not refer to this building.
 9. The Council suggest that the building and its attached neighbour were originally the Particular Baptist Chapel. This is not referred to in the *Appraisal* and the evidence to support this view appears to be an annotation on the 1848 map. This is far from precise. It is unclear as to whether it actually relates to this building or indeed whether this building is the building illustrated on the plan. The annotation is not included on the 1896 plan. The *Appraisal* makes reference to a Baptist Church but this is identified on the conservation area map.
 10. If I accept that this building represents a non-designated heritage asset, paragraph 135 of the *Framework* requires that the effect on its significance should be taken into account. A balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
 11. The evidence presented, including the lack of any physical evidence of any former use, does not suggest that the building is of particular significance other than with regard to its contribution as a building of townscape merit. The

Council refer to its original form and detail but it is clear that it has been much altered. I am not persuaded that this small addition would result in any change to the significance of the building. As the extension would be of a form similar to the existing outbuilding and be of matching materials, whilst retaining the existing form and fabric of the building overall, I am not satisfied that any harm would result.

12. Given the lack of visibility of the works from within the conservation area, the limited views from outside the conservation area and the lack of harm to the character or appearance of the building itself, I am not satisfied that the proposal would result in any significant change to the conservation area. I find its neutral impact to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.
13. The *Framework* is clear that any harm to a heritage asset, such as a conservation area, should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. However, I have not found there to be any harm to the conservation area. Policy DME4 of the Core Strategy 2014 sets out a presumption in favour of the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings. I have not found conflict with this policy or the heritage requirements of the *Framework*. The proposal would bring improvements to the property with regard to its function and this provides weight in its favour.
14. I have considered all the matters put forward by the Council but as I am satisfied that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and this building, I am not satisfied that there are any matters that weigh significantly against it. I therefore allow the appeal.
15. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and the details of the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have required that the materials match to ensure that the development would have a satisfactory appearance.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR