



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 October 2012

by D Kaiserman BA DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11 October 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/12/2182924

3 Redwood Drive, Longridge, Lancs, PR3 3HA

- 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 Ashley Burgon against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2012/0386 was refused by notice dated 20 July 2012.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension and dormers to front elevation. Resubmission of 3/2011/1079P.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the appearance of the host dwelling and on the wider street-scene.

Reasons

3. Redwood Drive is a principal route within a modern open-plan estate consisting primarily of detached houses. Due to subtle changes in level, the sinuous nature of the road and the variety of designs of the houses themselves, there is a general sense of informality in the overall character of the area.
4. The appeal property sits in a prominent location on a pronounced bend in the road. This results in its plot being significantly wider at the front than the back and a greater separation (when seen from the road) from its neighbours on either side than is generally to be found nearby. It is a two-storey house with prominent ground-floor projections accommodating a bay to a living-room and a separate wrap-around store and further living-room/porch. The proposal involves a first-floor side extension flush (for the most part) with the south-western wall, set down from the main roof ridge by 0.3m and back from the main front wall by 0.7m, together with the creation of two pitched-roof dormers in the front roof-slope to serve a new bedroom. A new small rooflight is also proposed.
5. In my opinion, the scheme would involve an ungainly set of additions to the building, producing an uncomfortably "top-heavy" and somewhat cluttered result. The minor set-ins from the main ridge and front walls would not create a convincing sense of subservience and this, combined with the extended gable, the dormers (uncharacteristic of the estate as a whole) and new

rooflight, and what I consider to be a poor relationship with the ground-floor fenestration, results in a fussy and incoherent roof-scape. This detracts from the design of the dwelling itself and, by extension, would be harmful in the wider street-scene.

6. I do not fully share the Council's view of the importance of preserving the scale of the gaps between the dwelling and its neighbours in its own terms; but having a gable at each side (only marginally modified by a high-level hip) would be inconsistent with the general approach throughout the estate, and this element adds to my criticisms of the scheme.
7. For these reasons, I consider that the proposal conflicts with "saved" Local Plan policies G1(a), G1(e) and H10. I have taken into account all the matters raised by the appellant, including references to other alterations which have been made to nearby dwellings, but these do not affect my conclusion, which is that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Kaiserman

INSPECTOR