



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2014

by **David Fitzsimon MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 4 June 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/14/2216951

70A Downham Road, Chatburn, Clitheroe, Lancashire BB7 4AU

- 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 & Mrs H Wood against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2013/1060, dated 18 December 2013, was refused by notice dated 12 February 2014.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a part two storey, part single storey side extension.
-

Application for Costs

1. An application for costs was made by the appellant against the Council which is the subject of a separate decision.

Procedural Matter

2. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the planning guidance issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government on 6 March 2014.

Decision

3. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a part two storey, part single storey side extension at 70A Downham Road, Chatburn, Clitheroe, Lancashire BB7 4AU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/2013/1060, dated 18 December 2013, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Drawing Ref No. Wood/633/1702/01 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main Issue

3. The Council is satisfied that the overall design and scale of the proposed extension would at least preserve the character and appearance of the
-

Chatburn Conservation Area and I have no reason to disagree. On this basis, the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupier(s) of No. 72 Downham Road with particular regard to outlook and access to natural light.

Reasons

4. The proposed extension would be built at the side of the host dwelling, replacing an existing single storey link garage structure. Although the proposed two storey section of the extension would obviously be much taller than the existing garage, it would be set slightly further from the side boundary. A footpath sits between the appeal property and No. 72 Downham Road and the flank elevation of this bungalow is set a comfortable distance from the side boundary of this property. According to the figures quoted by the Council, about 8.5 metres would separate the two storey section of the proposed extension from the flank elevation of the bungalow.
5. The Council argues that the greater scale and reduced distance at first floor level would be oppressive when seen from the kitchen window on the flank elevation of No. 72 and it would unacceptably reduce the amount of light entering this room. I am mindful, however, that this is a secondary window to the kitchen/diner of the bungalow, which is also served by a large bay window to the rear elevation. It is a room which enjoys good levels of natural light and I am satisfied that any reduction in the levels entering it as a result of the extension would not be unduly harmful. My finding in this respect is reinforced by the conclusions of a Light Assessment produced on behalf of the appellants following the refusal of planning permission.
6. The two storey section of the proposed extension would be closer to No. 72 than the main body of the existing house which means that the view from the kitchen window of the bungalow would be less open for its occupier(s). Nevertheless, a comfortable separation distance would remain and the effect would not be unduly oppressive. In reaching this finding, I am mindful that many dwellings in suburban locations sit much closer together and views from windows on flank elevations are often much more restricted as a result. Further, in this instance, the large bay window to the rear elevation provides the primary and a good quality outlook for the kitchen/diner.
7. In light of the above factors, I conclude that the proposed extension would not unduly compromise the levels of natural light or the outlook available to the occupier(s) of No. 72 Downham Road. In this respect, there is no conflict with policy DMG1 of the adopted Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy, saved policy G1 of the adopted Ribble Valley District Wide Local Plan or the overall aims of the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance titled '*Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings*'.
8. In addition to the standard conditions which limit the lifespan of the planning permission and direct that the development accords with the approved plans, the Council has suggested an additional condition to ensure the external materials of the extension match those of the host building. This is required to ensure a visually acceptable development.

David Fitzsimon INSPECTOR