

APPEAL STATEMENT OF CIARA BECKETT -against the decision of Ribble Valley Council to refuse planning application ref 3/2025/0880 – Retrospective application for single storey rear extension at 26 Whalley Road, Langho BB6 8EJ.

SITE HISTORY

3/2009/0663 – Extension to rear of dwelling -Approved

3/2010/0020 – Amendment to approved consent 3/2009/0663 to incorporate a window to the first floor rear elevation (storage area only) – Approved

3/2012/0034 – Proposed dormer windows to the front , side extension to the bungalow and demolition of existing garage – Approved

3/024/0155 – Retrospective change of use of dwelling C3 to C2 residential institution including demolition of garage and construction of a single storey side extension and additional parking to front – Refused

3/2024/0614 – Retention of and alterations to single storey side extension including alterations to the existing driveway and parking provision, and addition of a partial pitched roof – Refused – Appeal Dismissed

3/2025/0268- Non material amendment to planning permission 3/2012/0034 for alterations to the design of the previously approved side extension which remains extant following the implementation of other elements of the approved scheme – Approved

3/2025/0880 – Retrospective application for a single storey side extension – Refused

REASON FOR REFUSAL

The application was refused as the Council considered the “roof symmetry and overall scale, bulk and massing and proposed use of roof materials is considered to be of poor design and would read as unsympathetic, incongruous and over dominant addition to the property”. Its “prominent corner siting would mean that the development would be clearly visible in the streetscene and as such... would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area”. This was considered to conflict with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and para 135 c of the NPPF.

Following a recently dismissed appeal ref 3/2024/0614 regarding this extension the applicant has sought to regularise the work carried out at the site. Policy DMG 1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy requires development to be of a high standard of building design and be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses with particular emphasis being placed on visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings. It should not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area and should provide adequate day lighting and privacy distances. Ribble Valley has no supplementary planning guidance or documents which offer specific design advice or recommendations , therefore each case is assets on its own merits.

The single storey extension is almost identical to that which was approved in planning application 3/2025/0268. The ridge height of the extension in 3/2025/0268 was set down from the existing ridge height approximately 0.3m and was set in from the existing front wall by 0.5m, this was deemed to be acceptable. The ridge of the extension as built and subject of this appeal, is set down approximately 0.15m and the 0.5m set back from the front wall is provided. Whilst it is acknowledged that the set down, as built, is less than that which was previously approved, the applicant contends that visually the extension appears subservient to the main dwelling. Comparing the gable elevations of the previous approval Plan Ref 709/3B (Document 1) and the plans subject of this appeal, Ref 740/2A the extension with its sympathetic roof design, is clearly subservient and is not considered to be overly dominant as stated in the Officers Delegated Report.

It is considered that the work and expense required to undertake a further ridge set down of approximately 0.15m is not proportionate to the harm that the Council states the proposal causes to the surrounding area and is not proportionate to the negligible visual improvement it will provide. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is an overhang from the front eaves and soffit which the Council states, "diminishes its set back the application property's principal elevation", it is not considered this has a sufficiently detrimental impact to warrant a refusal of the application given that there is a set back of the front wall.

The applicant acknowledges that the roof tiles on the front elevation do not match the existing which are very unusual tile which have proved difficult to source. Since, refusal of the application the applicant has managed to source sufficient tiles to re-clad the front elevation of the extension which would blend well with the existing roof tiles. Should this appeal be upheld the applicant is happy to accept a condition for matching materials to be provided on the front roof slope.

The roof tiles on the rear facing roof slope are the same specification and colour as the existing roof tiles however, they are a brighter due to the weathering of the existing. This is not an unusual feature in residential areas where newer tiles are a different shade to the existing. The applicant has offered to power wash the existing tiles to achieve a better blend of materials.

Conclusion:

The surrounding area comprises a residential development of varying scale and design and it is not considered that this single storey extension with complementary roof design which incorporates a set down ridge and set back front wall with matching roof tiles that can be achieved by way of a condition, would result in sufficient visual harm to the surrounding area to warrant a refusal of the application.

In summary, the applicant respectfully requests that the appeal against the decision of Ribble Valley Council to refuse planning permission 3/2025/0880 is upheld and planning permission is granted.