

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2016

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7th December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/16/3160835
77 Inglewhite Road, Longridge, PR3 2NA

- 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 John Simpson against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2016/0701, dated 31 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is ground and first floor extensions to side & rear elevations with porch to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is one of a pair of attractive semi-detached properties on the southern side of Inglewhite Road. These properties are of a consistent design to the semi-detached properties to the east. The adjoining semi-detached property has a recessed 1.5 storey extension to the side.
 4. The proposed extension would create a large 2-storey addition to the existing dwelling. This would increase the width of the property by more than 50%, creating an unduly large and dominant extension that would detract from the appearance of the host property. This would appear incongruous within the street and would visually unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties. The proposed porch feature would further contribute to the unbalancing of the properties, and would be in advance of the existing bay window at the front. The harm caused by the extension would be exacerbated by its prominence in views from the west.
 5. Whilst the adjoining property (No 75) has an existing 1.5 storey side extension, this is recessed from the front elevation, and is much lower in height than the appeal proposal. The presence of this existing extension would not act as a counterbalance to the much larger and more prominent extension that is proposed.
-

6. In addition, whilst some sympathetic design features are proposed, such as the roof shape and matching materials and fenestration details, this would not overcome the concerns I have identified above. The presence of modern detached properties of a separate design to the west also does not justify a development of this nature.
7. I conclude that the development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy (2014). These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that new development is built to a high design standard.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. Whilst the development would allow the appellant additional accommodation space, this does not alter my view that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR