

Peter Hitchen Architects

Peter Hitchen Architects Ltd

Marathon House
The Sidings Business Park
Whalley
Lancashire
BB7 9SE
22 February 2022

APPELLANT STATEMENT

12 BEECH DRIVE, WHALLEY, LANCASHIRE

This statement is prepared to support the appeal related to the refusal notice dated 31 August 2021 (application reference – 3/2021/0899) for a two storey rear extension to the existing detached house.

Project description

Proposed two storey extension to rear and single storey extension to side.
Resubmission of 3/2021/0625.

Reason for refusal

The proposal would result in the introduction of an over dominant and incongruous form of development that fails to respond positively to the inherent character of the immediate pattern of housing, being of detriment to the character and visual amenities of the area. As such the proposal is considered to be in direct conflict with Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Principal reason for the appeal

The appellant has been in close liaisons with ourselves and we have also been in discussions with the case officer to obtain some clarity on the reason for the refusal. We stressed that the applicant had a previous refusal for a two storey rear extension in 2021 (application reference 3/2021/0625 and the resubmission which is the subject of this appeal addressed the concerns which were raised.

The delegated report from the previous application stated the following :-

The application property has two neighbours that are immediately adjacent and therefore both properties have the potential to be affected by the development. No 14 Beech Drive is sited to the west of the application property and its footprint is set further north of the application site. Due to this the proposed two storey extension will project beyond the rear wall of this neighbour but only by 750mm meaning that the impact in terms of loss of light and overbearing impact is minimal. Furthermore, the introduction of Juliette balconies on the rear elevation would not result in any further overlooking of the garden area of this neighbour when compared to the

existing situation. No windows are proposed to the side elevation that would face this property.

The neighbour to the north is no 1 Fell View. This neighbour is set further west of the application site therefore the proposed two storey extension would have minimal impact on this neighbour in terms of overlooking as the balconies would only overlook the front driveway of this property and an obscurely glazed window on the gable end of the property. Due to the separation distance between the two properties the development would have negligible impact on this property in terms of gloss of light and overbearing impact.

The new design, following the refusal, addressed the other issues with regard to the design massing and aesthetic (previously a flat roof with large areas of galzing) which the previous case officer remarked on. The new proposal demonstrates a more traditional pitched roof with facing brickwork and render finish as well as incorporating Juliet balconies which the previous case officer had supported.

Unfortunately, the latest application has been assessed by a different case officer who confirmed that he had a different opinion to the statements made by the previous officer with regard to aspects of the proposal. We request that the planning inspector reads both the previous delegated report and the latest one in order to obtain an understanding why this appeal has been submitted.

We offer the inspectorate an opinion that it cannot be the case that a professionally qualified chartered town planner, within an office with other chartered town planners can so advise on a resubmitted application in the same office and looking at the same planning policy criteria can come up with a different interpretation.

We request that the planning inspector applies considerable weight to the failure of the authority to provide a consistent service when assessing what we consider to be a very simple proposal of a two storey rear extension in an established residential setting using materiality and massing entirely consistent with the local vernacular which is obviously the case with the resubmitted proposal.

We contest the reason for the refusal and disagree that the proposal is 'incongruous' and is 'of detriment to the character and visual amenities of the area'

Regards

Peter Hitchen RIBA