

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2016

by A J Mageean BA (Hons) BPI PhD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/B2355/D/3154670

18 Coppice Drive, Whitworth, Rochdale OL12 8QA

- 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 Mrs Keeley Lord against the decision of Rossendale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/0186, dated 30 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side elevation extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located at the easternmost extent of Coppice Drive adjacent to expansive open land to the east, which is crossed by several public footpaths. It is in an elevated position, with Coppice Drive itself rising steeply to this point from the A671. In common with other properties in this part of the cul-de-sac, the appeal property is detached, of relatively modern design and constructed from stone with a slate roof. Most of the neighbouring properties have modestly sized rectangular plots and the houses are largely uniform in appearance and located reasonably close to each other. However, the appeal property is somewhat set apart from its neighbours, in a slightly more elevated position, and on an irregularly shaped plot which extends considerably to the south. The property itself also extends much further back into the plot than its neighbours, creating elongated east and west elevations.
 4. This proposal would place a two storey extension on top of the existing double garage which is the northernmost part of the property. Due to the rise in ground levels to the east, whilst the garage doors to the west are at street level, to the rear the garage roof is at the same level as the rear garden. The two storey extension would sit above the garage at the same level as, and be a continuation of, the existing east and west elevations of this property, extending the gabled roof in the same manner as existing.
-

5. I have already noted that this property is a prominent element of the local street scene due to its location. It is also more visible than adjacent properties when viewed from the open land to the east. As such, my view is that the proposal would extend the already prominent east and western elevations further to the north and into the local street scene, creating an elongated structure which would be visually domineering in local views in and around this area. This would contrast with current local built form which is both at a lower level, and generally has less extensive elevations. Furthermore, this extension would be a conspicuous and significant structure which would dominate the appearance of the host dwelling. The expanse of blank wall on the western elevation would also draw attention to this structure.
6. The appellant has pointed to examples of other extensions in the area which it is suggested are not subordinate to their host dwellings. Whilst I do not have the full details of these cases before me to enable comparison, I was able to see them on my site visit. My view is that these examples are in less prominent locations, and flanked by properties on both sides such that they are less intrusive in the local street scene.
7. I accept that the appellant gained pre-application advice which suggested that such an extension would be acceptable. Such advice is given on a without prejudice basis. In this case I have judged the application on the basis of the plans submitted and having looked at the site itself. My view is that it would be damaging to local character and appearance.
8. I also note the appellant's health and safety concerns regarding the current garage roof which can be accessed from the rear garden. Whilst there is currently a low wall around the garage roof this is felt to be insufficient to manage the drop to ground level at the north western corner. However, such concerns do not in themselves justify this extension.
9. I conclude on this matter that the proposed extension would have a damaging effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with the Rossendale Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 which at Policies 1, 23 and 24 requires development to be of high quality design which complements and enhances the surrounding area in terms of, amongst other things, scale, views, massing and layout. It would also conflict with the Supplementary Planning Guidance '*Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties*' as it would not complement the existing building.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, taking into consideration all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

AJ Mageean

INSPECTOR