

I would like to appeal the decision of Ribble Valley Council regarding my application no 3/2021/0785 - *Proposed balcony/patio area above the double garage, with 1.150m high glass balustrade, accessed by wooden steps from the garden.*

First I would mention that NO person from your offices came to view the area where the 'development' are to be carried out. I, therefore, find it difficult to understand how the knowledge of a conservatory at No2, as mentioned in the refusal - *"as a result of its design, elevated position and proximity to the shared boundary, would lead to overlooking of the rear conservatory and garden areas of no2"* - could have been established by the Council.

As it was not seen first-hand by any of your officers, nor is it visible from my back garden had they visited at ground level, how could it be decided by the Council that it *"would have a detrimental effect upon the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupants"*?

 bedroom window overlooks the garden of No2 in exactly the same way as the proposed 'development', as it is situated above the flat roof. How am I to prevent *"a detrimental effect upon the residential amenities"* for bedroom? And in the same vein, the existing balcony at No2 overlooks bedroom window, is this not a breach and therefore *"loss of privacy"* Perhaps this should be considered.

Planning permission for 'development' at this property, No1 The Hazels, was granted on 04/05/2006 – Planning Application No.16408.

Following Planning Officer Mark Ollerenshaw's site visit the proposal was APPROVED stating:-

Site visit	Existing flat roof over garage not attractive and first floor extension and balcony not going to have significant impact on next door neighbour due to reasonable gap. Also conifer hedge has potential to screen balcony from neighbour's first floor window and balcony (but likely to be mutual overlooking). Variety of dormer extensions on this estate and no uniformity of street scene. Single storey extension sufficient distance away from neighbours and screening on boundaries.
------------	---

I therefore cannot understand why a similar proposal on this occasion has been refused?

There are a number of precedents for balconies, including glass/metal balustrades, at The Hazels – those of No2 and No3 The Hazels, and also No5 Vicarage Lane. (See photos and site plan enclosed)

I would ask that you reconsider this application in light of the information I have provided.

- The proposed balcony is not a 'development'. It is a patio of simple design, with glass/metal balustrades 1.150m high, in keeping with a number of precedents in the area. (see photos)
- It will have access via a natural wooden staircase from my own back garden.
- There is no further 'overlooking of the rear conservatory and garden areas of no2' than is already present from bedroom, which has a window onto the flat roof and therefore the same view.
- No one from your offices has been to view the proposed plan first hand. Had they done so they would realise;
- As Mr Ollerenshaw states on 04/05/2006 in his approval for a planning application No16408 on this same flat roof – it is *'not going to have significant impact on next door neighbour due to a significant gap'*
- It is not, and has never been, my intention to intrude on my neighbours at No2. I simply seek to enjoy the fabulous view of the Ribble Valley from my garage flat roof, just as my neighbours do from their properties. I would appreciate being granted this facility.