

GROUND FORS APPEAL – SUPPORTING STATEMENT Ribble Valley Borough Council
planning reference: 3/2022/1073

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED: Two storey side extension, replacement single storey rear extension and conversion of existing outbuilding to form ancillary accommodation.
The reason for refusal of the application was cited as follows:

AT: 77 Ribchester Road Wilpshire BB1 9HT

Ribble Valley Borough Council hereby give notice in pursuance of the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that permission has been refused for the carrying out of the above development for the following reason(s):

1 The proposed development, by virtue of its height and proximity to a common boundary and neighbouring windows forming part of habitable rooms, would result in a loss of natural light, outlook and sense of enclosure to a directly adjacent neighbouring property which in turn would be unduly harmful to the amenity of the occupants residing at the property known as No. 75 Ribchester Road. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to be in conflict with Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

2 The proposal, by virtue of its scale, massing, spatial alignment and visual prominence would result in the creation of an over dominant and unsympathetic form of development that would be harmful to the visual amenities and inherent character of the area. As such, the proposal would be in direct conflict with Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy.

Appeal Argument:

With regards to refusal points 1 and 2 listed above, it is important that we point out, during the original planning submission, the planning officer suggested that the submitted and refused planning drawing referenced 1094/RRC/PL1 Rev C would be acceptable if the following alterations had been made:

1. Narrowing of the two storey side extension from 2.7m to 1.9m wide
2. Removal of the single storey rear extension linking the main house and outbuilding

This email transcription is included as part of the appeal documentation.

The appellant was not in agreement with this suggestion, we write on behalf of the applicant for the following reasons:

TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

Narrowing the two storey element by 0.8m would render it practically unusable internally with a clear room width of 1.9m, which isn't wide enough for a bedroom for the applicants needs.

Cited refusal point 1 related to loss of light on the neighbouring property (75 Ribchester Road) side elevation – we do not understand how narrowing the two storey element by 0.9m to 1.8m wide would dramatically increase the light source to the neighbour, over its current proposed width of 2.7m therefore the request from the planning department was not agreeable.

Whilst it is accepted that the neighbouring property, 75 Ribchester Road, has a side window to a habitable room on its side gable at ground floor level, it is not unlike many other properties in the immediate locality which have been approved by Ribble Valley Borough council (hereby referred to as RVBC for the remainder of this statement) for similar or more imposing side extensions.

Refusal point 2 cites overdevelopment of the application property and its impact on the wider area.

The proposed plans 1094/RRC/PL1 revision C were amended from their original submitted format with a stepped front elevation and lower roof ridgeline to the two storey side extension to ensure the addition would clearly be less dominant from the street frontage and offer a clear break from the host property.

This is a generally acceptable approach for a two storey side extension to a semi detached or detached dwelling and we feel that the refused plans would not be dominant within the streetscene or wider area.

SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION LINKING FROM THE MAIN HOUSE TO THE EXISTING OUTBUILDING

RVBC also had concerns with the connection of the existing single storey outbuilding into the main residence close to the boundary line following objections from the neighbouring property.

A low impact rear link extension was proposed which was sited more than 700mm from the common boundary of 75/77 Ribchester Road with a low level eaves height matching that of the existing outbuilding, less than 2.3m above finished ground level and a ridge height less than 3.3m for the link rising to a maximum height of 3.7m at the intersection with the original rear elevation line of the host property.

This link would also replace an existing rear projection currently erected on the application property of similar intersection height at 3.7m.

We do not understand how this constitutes overbearing development on the common boundary as it is within allowances for detached outbuildings widely accepted national under permitted development allowances.

The single storey rear link was designed as sympathetically as possible with a low pitch apex roof, as not to impose on the neighbours at 75 Ribchester Road. IF the approval had not been sought for the side extension, the applicant could quite easily apply for a front extension to the existing garage/outbuilding complying with permitted development allowances which could be built in the area of the link aspect

The single storey link would certainly have no overbearing impact on the wider streetscene as it is unviewable from Ribchester Road behind the two storey side extension.

During the planning process, the planning officer argued that if approved, the side extension may create a 'terracing effect' should 75 and 79 Ribchester Road decide to apply/erect similar extensions. The property at 81 Ribchester Road was approved for a two storey side extension which has given precedence to the immediate locality.

I appreciate that IF 75 and 79 also applied for side extensions it would bring the streetview massing together but it is no different to any other residential street containing such extensions nationwide, added to this, I do not believe terracing concerns could be brought into the

reasons for refusal of a householder planning application if no such adjoining extensions exist to consider.

Arguments were also raised regarding the impact on Showley Court, to the rear of the application property. I also disagree with the comments about the proposed extensions being of impact to the bungalows on Showley Court, each and every house from 79 to 85 Ribchester Road all have rear extensions and detached outbuildings closer to Showley Court than that of the submitted plans and being a single storey link, would be barely visible from this location.

NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES WITH APPROVED AND ERECTED EXTENSIONS:

We expand on this matter of the supporting statement and attach examples of identical neighbouring properties with approved and constructed side/rear extensions within the immediate locality which set precedence for the area.

81 Ribchester Road

The recently approved extension at 81 Ribchester Road has been approved on/over the party wall line AND protruding beyond the original rear wall. 81 Ribchester Road also appears to have a number of window openings at ground floor level looking directly into 79 Ribchester Road's driveway and kitchen area.



Photo 1 – 81 Ribchester Road – Two storey side extension approved on the shared boundary line with side window to 79 Ribchester Road evident to the left of the photo.



Photo 2 – 81 Ribchester Road rear view currently under construction with two storey side extension projecting past the rear wall of host property.

42 to 52 Ribchester Road

A group of 5 consecutive semi detached properties with 2 storey side and rear extensions within 100m of the application property.



Photo 3 – Streetview of 42 to 52 Ribchester Road – all semi detached properties with larger extensions than the application property sought.

59 and 61 Ribchester Road



Photo 4 – Streetview of 59 and 61 Ribchester Road with two storey side extensions protruding to the side and beyond the original rear walls of the host properties.

We request that **All** of the above properties are taken into account when considering this appeal decision and a site visit will highlight many more similar approved extensions within 250m of the application site.

Please refer to the accompanying documents which were submitted with the planning application including the site plans, design and access report and historic maps contained within.
DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED TO RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REGARDING
PLANNING APPLICATION: 3/2022/1073

1. 1094/RRC/PL1 C – Existing and Proposed floor plans and elevations of the application property
2. 1094/RRC/BP A – Proposed site layout/block plan
3. 1094/RRC/LP – Site location plan
4. Email transcript from RVBC dated 14/02/2023 requesting alterations to the submitted extension plans

Supporting statement compiled by the appointed agents BPD Architecture CIAT registered architectural technologists.

Report written by company director Mr Michael Beech MCIAT dated 17th March 2023.