
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2014

by Mrs A Fairclough MA BSc(Hons) LLB(Hons) PGDipLP(Bar) IHBC MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 23 October 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/14/2223729
10 Chatburn Park Drive, Clitheroe, Lancashire BB7 2AY

- 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 and Mrs Emery against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 3/2014/0447 dated 16 May 2014, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2014.
 - The development is described as "the proposed demolition of existing attached garage and rear porch to create the space for new single storey rear and side extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. There are 2 main issues in this case. Firstly, the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the locality. Secondly, the effect of the proposed extension on highway safety.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal dwelling, No 10 Chatburn Park Drive, is a 2-storey dwelling within a predominantly residential area. It is faced in stone with pebble dash render to the 2-storey projecting bays. It has a hipped roof form over the main dwelling with a mansard-like roof extending downwards creating a facing feature to part of the front elevation from the eaves level to above the main entrance door. This is also clad in concrete tiles. There is a lean-to side extension which incorporates a garage/rear porch attached to the side elevation. The locality is characterised by a mixture of 2-storey dwellings and bungalows. Although these dwellings exhibit a variety of designs, styles and materials, there is consistency in the use of the design elements, including the mansard-like cladding features and the use of materials. These elements are repeated throughout the estate to create homogeneity. This homogeneity contributes positively to the area.
4. Nos 8 and 10 are a pair of semi-detached dwellings. Although they are of a similar form and mass, they are asymmetrical in their appearance and design details when viewed from the road. However, the design of this pair of semi-detached is typical of the area and is repeated in other pairs of semi-detached

- dwellings in the vicinity such that they appear attractive and add to the local distinctiveness of the street scene and locality.
5. The proposed extension includes the demolition of the existing side extension and the erection of a "wrap-around" side and rear extension. It would be set forward from the original garage line so that it would align with the front elevation of the main dwelling. It would be some 4m high and would incorporate a unique steep roof form to the front elevation in an attempt to harmonise it with the tiled mansard-like feature above the main entrance to the original dwelling. The new roof form to the extension would be clad in timber weatherboarding and this would extend across the front elevation of the main dwelling, with the timber weather boarding replacing the original tiles on the mansard like feature. In addition the proposed scheme would also introduce tall, slim windows on the front elevation.
 6. Given the increased mass, form and the slightly forward position of the proposed extension when compared with the existing garage, it would create a dominant and prominent feature on the appeal dwelling. Furthermore, given the introduction of a variety of uncharacteristic design features, it would emphasise its incongruity. These features include the introduction of timber weatherboard cladding to the front elevation and the proposed windows, which would not reflect the typically strong horizontal emphasis in window design in the locality. It would also undermine the homogeneity of the character of the area by diluting the strong design features and the consistent use of materials in the locality as exhibited on other similar pairs of semi-detached dwellings in the street.
 7. I note the appellant's design approach and that the proposed fenestration was informed by the single slim window adjacent to the main entrance. However, this simple window is part of the entrance design and would not reflect the fenestration elsewhere on the dwelling. I acknowledge the appellants comment that the concrete tiles are in a poor condition and that concrete tiles have been replaced on other similar properties in the locality. However, none of the properties in the locality of a similar design and form had timber weatherboard cladding. I note the form of the proposed extension was informed by the need for natural light and to possibly install more solar panels if desired. I also note that this would reduce energy costs. However, this is not a reason to accept poor design and would not overcome my concerns relating to the harmful effect of the proposed extension on the appeal dwelling or its locality.
 8. I note the appellants' reference to other dwellings in the locality. However I am not aware of the background of these schemes but I saw that these schemes related to a different dwelling designs and types and in one case the replacement of a detached dwelling and these are not comparable to the appeal before me. In any case I am required to determine each appeal on its own merits in the light of current policy.
 9. Thus the proposed development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, this pair of semi-detached dwellings and the locality. It would be contrary to the *Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled Planning Policy Note & Design Guidance: Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings* dated 2000 (SPG), which indicates that proposed extensions should reflect the character of the original dwelling and the wider locality, should not introduce design features which are not in keeping with the original house and

should use matching materials. It would conflict with Policy G1 of the *Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan* (LP) and emerging Policy DMG1 of the *Core Strategy 2008 – 2028: A local plan for Ribble Valley regulation 22 Submission Draft* (CS). LP Policy G1 and CS Policy DMG1 state that all development should be of a high standard of design. It would also conflict with LP Policy H10, which requires that residential extensions should reflect the context of the locality and would not accord with the objectives of CS Policy DMH5, which states that proposals to extend or alter existing dwellings must accord with CS Policy DMG.

Highway Safety

10. The proposed development would result in the loss of the garage. The Council considers that this would reduce the number of on-site parking spaces from two spaces to one space and that this would not accord with the Council's standard on car parking. However, I have no information relating to this car parking standard or whether this standard is a maximum or minimum standard. Furthermore, the appeal site would provide one off-street parking space and the appellants' have suggested that there is potential for a second to be created on the front garden, which has been undertaken at other properties in the locality. Chatburn Park Drive is a 2-way carriageway serving residential development and the properties on this road can be accessed via Chatburn Avenue also. There are no parking restrictions. There is street lighting and a speed limit of 20mph. There are footways on both sides of the road and all dwellings have off road parking facilities. At the time of the site visit the road was quiet and there was no on street parking. Given the quiet residential character of the area and the nature of the other roads, which are unclassified, I do not consider that this is an unusual occurrence. From the information before me there is no substantiated evidence that the parking of a vehicle on the street would be detrimental to highway safety. On this basis, I consider that the proposed development would not conflict with the relevant objective of LP Policy G1, which refers to adequate arrangements for car parking.

Conclusions

11. Although I have concluded that the proposed development would not cause harm to highway safety on Chatburn Park Drive, I consider the harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling, this pair of semi-detached dwellings and the general locality is the determining factor in this case. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

A Fairclough

INSPECTOR