



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2012

by R E Watson BA (Hons)

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

Decision date: 9 October 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/12/2181512
8 Rogersfield, Langho, BB6 8HB

- 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 J Shaw against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2012/0164P, dated 14th February 2012, was refused by notice dated 4th May 2012.
 - The development proposed is 2no dormers to house new study/dressing rooms and erection of new lean-to to orangery.
-

Clarification

1. The Council's description of the proposal in their Delegated Report reads, "garage extension with accommodation in roof to the S. gable elevation with dormer to the front and rear roof slope. Proposed dormer to the front elevation of main property and single-storey lean-to extension to the rear". Having examined the submitted plans most carefully, I consider this to be a more comprehensive and accurate description of the proposed scheme, and I have assessed the proposal on that basis.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for garage with accommodation in roof to the S. gable elevation with dormer to the front and rear roof slope; proposed dormer to the front elevation of the main property and single-storey lean-to extension to the rear, at 8. Rogersfield, Langho, BB6 8HB, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/2012/0164P, dated 14th February 2012, and the plans submitted with it, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Ref: SHAW/DE/PL/01-B & the amended plan of the proposed floor plans and elevations (received 03/05/2012) – Ref: SHAW/DE/PL/04-B.

Application for costs

3. An application for costs was made by the Appellant against the Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

4. The key issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the immediate street scene.

Reasons

5. The main concern of the Council focuses on the visual effect of the proposed extension to the S. gable elevation which faces on to Rogersfield. They argue that the likely visual prominence of this structure would be unduly obtrusive and detract from the open layout of this estate.
6. I note that this development was constructed in the 1970s with an open plan layout. The present entrance from the Whalley Road junction is flanked by open areas and gives some indication of the original design theme that underpinned this development. However, during the intervening decades this character has changed in subtle, yet significant, ways. Many of the dwellings, particularly those occupying corner plots, are now set in mature gardens containing trees of substantial size, which are enclosed by dense, tall hedges. These provide major visual landscaped elements within the estate and have fundamentally altered the original open character of the layout.
7. The appeal site is a prime example with the garden containing two prominent mature trees and the Rogersfield boundary firmly delineated by a 3m high Leylandii hedge which screens much of the S. gable elevation. I accept that the proposed extension would project above the height of this hedge and would extend the gable elevation towards the estate road. Nevertheless, it has been carefully designed as a subservient addition to the main dwelling and would not be significantly higher than the extension approved in this position earlier. My firm impression was that the proposed extension would be a minor element in the street scene, largely masked by the boundary treatment, and would not fundamentally change the appearance of the host dwelling or its relationship with this part of Rogersfield.
8. I am satisfied that this proposal would appropriately complement the present property without compromising the character and appearance of the dwelling or its setting. In my view, it would not conflict with the relevant Policies G1 and H10 of the Ribble Valley District-wide Local Plan and it would largely chime with the guidance set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance concerning Alterations to Dwellings.

Other Matters

9. In reaching this conclusion, I have taken account of all other matters raised, including the references to the NPPF, in particular paragraphs 58 and 64; the proposed access provision, which remains unchanged from that previously approved as part of the earlier permission for an extension to this gable, and the views of the Council on the remaining elements of this proposal. However, none of these has deflected me from my conclusions on the key issue.

RE Watson

Inspector