



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2013

by **C J Checkley BA(Hons) MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 16 April 2013

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/13/2194224**

**26 Waddow Grove, Waddington, Clitheroe, Lancashire, BB7 3JL**

- 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 Peter Forkasiewicz against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 3/2012/0938 was refused by notice dated 12 December 2012.
  - The development proposed is new double side extension including balcony to the rear. Alterations to materials for base of existing front extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary matter

2. In his grounds of appeal the appellant suggests several amendments that could be made to the scheme. However, these would result in a materially different proposal and I am unable to take them into account. I am obliged to determine this full application on the basis of the detailed drawings that were formally considered by the Council.

## Main issues

3. There are 2 main issues regarding the effects of the development: first, the effect upon the appearance and character of the area; second, the effect upon the living conditions of the neighbouring residents, with particular regard to levels of privacy, sunlight and visual impact.

## Reasons

### *Appearance and character*

4. This section of the residential road is characterised by a series of regularly-spaced detached chalet-style bungalows of a similar design. The pitched-roof gables face the road with the eaves of the dwellings extending down level with the top of the ground floor windows. The front gardens generally have an open plan layout. The repeated rhythm of the similar designs set behind the open front gardens with reasonable spacing of some 4-6m between the individual bungalows gives the street scene an attractive appearance and character that is locally distinctive.
5. The proposal would involve a two-storey side extension the full depth of the existing dwelling and extending virtually to the shared boundary with No 25. Its construction would require the removal of the well-established boundary

hedge which adjoins the path along the side of No 25. Although the extension would have a pitched roof with its apex at the same height as the existing bungalow its gable would be noticeably narrower and the pitched roof markedly steeper as a result, with its new eaves set up high at first floor level. The side extension would remain open at ground level to allow parking beneath it. At the rear an external staircase and balcony would be constructed to provide access to the new self-contained first floor accommodation.

6. The design of the extended dwelling would be out of keeping with others in the road and would sit uneasily beside the host building. The characteristic visual gap between the low eaves of the bungalows at the appeal site and neighbouring No 25 would be severely diminished, with a new two-storey flank wall about 4.1m high with a steeply pitched roof above standing on the boundary under 2m from the low eaves to the flank of No 25.
7. In this context the extension would create a cramped effect within the street scene, looking as though it had been squeezed into too narrow a gap. The constrained effect would be emphasised by the absence of the middle section of the boundary hedge and the interruption of the rhythm created by the pattern of similar bungalows and spaces between them. There would be a similarly harmful impact to the rear of the dwelling, where the squashed effect would be compounded by the dominating nature of the new stairs and balcony.
8. The appellant drew my attention to the extension to the far side of a neighbouring bungalow at No 24. However, that extension is subsidiary in nature and set well back from the main front elevation of its host, and it also adjoins the garage to the side of No 23, so that the impression of a visual gap between neighbouring dwellings is maintained in the street scene.
9. I conclude that the scale, massing and proximity of the extension to the neighbouring dwelling at No 25 would cause significant harm to the appearance and character of this attractive residential area. This would be contrary to the provisions of saved Policies G1 and H10 of the Ribble Valley Districtwide Local Plan (LP) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance on alterations and extensions to dwellings (SPG), as well as Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Regulation 22 Submission Draft Core Strategy (DCS) which in combination seek well-designed extensions sympathetic to the host building and surrounding area.

*Living conditions of the neighbouring residents*

10. The proximity and height of the 2-storey extension rising up on the boundary to the south-west of the neighbouring property at No 25 would result in a significant overshadowing of and overbearing effect upon the neighbours' rear patio in particular and upon the secondary lounge window in the flank wall. Regular use of the proposed external stairs and balcony adjoining the boundary would also result in the neighbours suffering dominating overlooking and a severe loss of privacy within their rear garden. The rear garden at No 27 would also be unacceptably overlooked. These harmful effects would be contrary to the residential amenity provisions of saved LP Policies G1 and H10, the SPG and draft DCS Policies DMG1 and DMH5.

*C J Checkley*

INSPECTOR