



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2022

by Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20TH April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/22/3293498

12 Beech Drive, Whalley, CLITHEROE, BB7 9RA

- 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 Zane Reddy against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
- The application Ref 3/2021/0899, dated 29 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2021.
- The development proposed is proposed two-storey extension to rear and single storey extension to side. Resubmission of 3/2021/0625.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and wider area.

Reasons

3. The host property lies in a prominent position on the corner of Beech Drive and Fell View, within a spacious modern development associated with the former Calderstones Hospital. Due to the configuration of the plot, which becomes narrower and shorter at the back, and the proximity of the house to the boundary, the side of the house is highly visible when approaching from Beech Drive, and the rear of the house is particularly obvious when viewed from Fell View, which at the time of my site visit, I noted was well used by dog walkers accessing the woodland at the end of the cul-de-sac.
4. The proposed rear extension would extend the whole width of the ground floor, with a considerable two-storey gable extension and a flat roofed element closest to the brick wall bordering Fell View. In isolation, the design of the proposed development could be considered to be acceptable.
5. Indeed, the weeping willow within the garden and the ornamental flowering trees on the nearby verge would provide some screening when in leaf. However, this would not be all year. Moreover, whilst the ridge line of the projecting extension would be slightly lower than that of the original gable, and the ground floor extension closest to the wall would be flat roofed, due to the depth and width of the proposal, the cumulative scheme would be seen as a bulky development. This would contrast with the scale of the original surrounding housing. Consequently, the resultant bulk, given the prominence

and orientation of the host property, would appear imposing and overbearing in the street scene, when viewed from Beech Drive and Fell View.

6. Notwithstanding the plans were amended to include a reduction in the size of the windows of the proposed rear elevation, and the introduction of an area of rendering on the gable, the adverse impact of the bulk of the development would be further compounded by the introduction of Juliet windows at the first floor. These would catch one's eye and appear as an alien design feature when viewed in the context of the existing rear elevations of the neighbouring properties on Beech Drive, which can be clearly seen from Fell View.
7. As set out above, the proposed extension would therefore have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the wider area. As such, it would be contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy adopted 2014, whose relevant policies, relating to the importance of good design in all scale of developments, remain consistent with the design objectives of the Framework.

Other matters

8. I understand that the appellant has concerns how this and a previous planning application were considered by planning officers, including apparent inconsistencies in the decision-making process. However, I must determine the appeal on the basis of the scheme before me.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Louise Nurser

INSPECTOR