
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2017

by **B.Hellier BA(Hons) MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 30th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F2360/D/16/3162420

17 Holland Avenue, Walton-le-Dale, Preston, PR5 4RJ

- 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 C Whiteside against the decision of South Ribble Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 07/2016/0519/HOH, dated 30 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two story side and rear extension and a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. I consider the main issues are the effect of the proposal, firstly, on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and, secondly, on the living conditions of the adjacent property, 19 Holland Avenue, in relation to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dormer bungalow. The proposed development is a mix of single and two storeys. The two storey element would project 1.8m to the side and 2m at the rear. The single storey element would incorporate the footprint of an existing garage and project 2m to the side and 5.5m to the rear.
4. The side extension would be set back behind the front wall. The ridge would be lower than that of the main roof whilst keeping to the same pitch. The symmetry of the semi-detached pair would be maintained and there would be no adverse impact on the street scene.
5. To the rear the development would appear as a more substantial alteration and much of the original form of the property would be lost. However the ridge of the extension would again be below the main ridge and its bulk would be reduced by the use of hipped roofs. The ground floor extension would run across about half the width of the main rear elevation. This would allow an L-shaped back garden of reasonable size to be retained. As a result the new layout would not appear unduly cramped. Bearing in mind that the rear of the

property is not readily visible from the public domain and is less sensitive than the front in townscape terms I find that the proposed development would not have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area or conflict with the design principles described in Policy G17 of the Local Plan¹.

Living conditions

6. The neighbouring dwelling, No.19, is also a semi-detached dormer bungalow of very similar design. The side gable walls of the two properties are some 5.0m apart, the gap being filled by the respective drives. The appeal property has a garage built right up to the boundary. The kitchen and dining room windows of No.19 look out onto its blank side wall. A conservatory extends the dining room to the rear.
7. The proposed two storey side extension would be directly in front of and only about 3.0m from the kitchen window. Whilst there would still be oblique views of the sky to the east it would result in what is currently a poor outlook becoming one that would be oppressive.
8. The dining room window would be less affected by the two storey extension although the shallow roof pitch on the single story extension² would increase the sense of enclosure. However the dining room also benefits from light from the conservatory. Three small windows in the side of the extension facing No.19 would be glazed in obscure glass to avoid overlooking.
9. Local design guidance for extensions³ seeks to ensure that blank walls are no less than 13m from neighbouring facing habitable rooms. For assessing daylight needs the Council treats kitchens as habitable rooms⁴. Logic suggests this should also apply when considering outlook. The two storey extension would clearly not comply with this guidance in relation to the kitchen window and in this respect would fail to satisfy the requirement in Local Plan Policy G17 that new development should not have an undue overbearing or overshadowing effect.
10. I find that the proposed development would have a serious adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent property, 19 Holland Avenue, in relation to outlook.

Planning balance and conclusion

11. The property is occupied by the elderly and frail mother of the appellant. The appellant and her husband also live there and are seeking to enlarge and reorganise the property to enable them to care for her mother but at the same time allow for a degree of separation and privacy. Unquestionably this is a laudable aim. National guidance⁵ states that *supporting independent living can help to reduce the costs to health and social services and many older people may not want or need specialist accommodation or care and may wish to stay or move to general housing that is already suitable, such as bungalows, or homes which can be adapted to meet a change in their needs.*

¹ South Ribble Local Plan (2012-2026). Adopted July 2015

² Which replaces the existing flat roofed garage

³ *Residential Extensions*. Supplementary Planning Document. South Ribble Borough Council. Adopted January 2013 (Design Guidance Note DG3)

⁴ *Residential Extensions* paragraph C1.7

⁵ Planning Policy Guidance: *Housing and economic development needs assessments* Paragraph 021

12. Nonetheless in this instance, on the basis of the submitted scheme, I find that the serious harm that would be caused to living conditions in No.19 clearly outweighs the benefits. An alternative scheme reduced in scale would still enable some semi-independent accommodation to be provided.
13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Bern Hellier

INSPECTOR