

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2016

by Alexander Walker MPlan MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/B2355/D/16/3157529

5 Ivy Close, Waterfoot, Rossendale BB4 7BN

- 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 and Mrs Tracey and Neil Winfield against the decision of Rossendale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/0256, dated 21 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey side extension.
-

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. Ivy Close is a modern residential development comprising three pairs of two-storey, semi-detached properties located in a cul-de-sac. The dwellings are similar in their size and design, with front gable elements flanking either side of the pairs of properties. The set back positioning of the dwellings, their open frontages and the gaps between the properties create a sense of spaciousness which provides a relief to the close form of development on the neighbouring streets which generally consist of traditional two-storey terraces that front onto the highway.
 4. The proposed extension would occupy almost the full width of the gap between the side elevation and the boundary with the neighbouring property, No 4 Ivy Close. The front elevation of the extension would be set back from that of the front gable and would follow the recessed forward building line. The eaves and ridgeline would match the existing.
 5. The Rossendale Borough Council Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) advises, amongst other things, that two-storey side extensions that would produce a terracing effect will not be permitted. It goes on to state that the front elevation above ground level should be set back by at least 1.5m from the main frontage. In this instance, the gable element projects forward of the recessed front elevation. However, given that it is the widest part of the elevation, albeit only slightly,
-

and corresponds with the bulk of the roof, I find that the recessed element of the front elevation forms the main frontage. As the first floor would not be set back from the main frontage it would fail to accord with the SPD.

6. The lack of any set back from the recessed elevation would result in the continuation of the existing eaves height and ridgeline of the existing dwelling. In addition to the extension's proximity to the boundary with No 4, it would significantly reduce the gap between the properties and therefore result in a terracing effect that would adversely harm the spaciousness of the area. Although the front gable elements of the properties are not typically found on terraces within the locality, their presence would not prevent any terracing effect.
7. I note the appellant's contention that setting the extension back 1.5m from the recessed front elevation as opposed to the gable would result in a poor design and would not meet their needs. However, I can only consider the proposal before me and there is no substantive evidence that would outweigh the harm I have identified above.
8. I find therefore that the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies 1, 23 and 24 of the Rossendale Borough Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011, which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development complements and enhances the surrounding area, is compatible with its surroundings and is of the highest standard of design. In addition, it would also fail to accord with the guidance set out in the SPD and the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

9. I have had regard to the appellant's argument that the Council has previously allowed extensions that do not have a set back of 1.5m. However, the schemes referred to at 123 and 177 Newchurch Road, Rawtenstall nevertheless are set back to some extent. As I have found that the proposal would not be set back, there is no direct comparison with the schemes referred to. In any event, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Alexander Walker

INSPECTOR