
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2017

by Mike Worden BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B2355/D/17/3167743

2 Heycrofts View, Edenfield, Bury BL0 0HG

- 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 Jonathan Rostron against the decision of Rossendale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/0434, dated 13 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a garden room linking the existing dwelling to the existing detached garage and extending the garage upwards to provide a new games room at first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a garden room linking the existing dwelling to the existing detached garage and extending the garage upwards to provide a new games room at 2 Heycrofts View, Edenfield, Bury BL0 0HG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2016/0434, dated 13 September 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 16-09-01, 16-09-05, 16-09-09, and 16-09-10.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area with particular relevance to street scene.

Reasons

3. Heycrofts View is a small cul de sac of modern detached properties situated off a main road, Market Street. Heycrofts View rises gently from Market Street and curves, such that most of the properties in the cul de sac sit behind the older properties on Market Street. The view from Market Street up Heycrofts View affords an important glimpse of the nearby hills and countryside at the top of the curve. The appeal site lies close to the well landscaped entrance to
-

the cul de sac. The garage and most of the house is visible from Market Street. There is a short section of unadopted road, Elizabeth Street, which runs parallel to Heycrofts View immediately behind the existing garage of the appeal site.

4. The proposal would extend the garage sideways at ground floor level to link to the house, and raise the ridge and eaves height of the existing single storey detached garage. I will deal with these two elements in turn.
 5. I consider that the linking of the garage and the house at number 2 Heycrofts View at ground floor level would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and indeed the principle of it has now been accepted by the Council in the subsequent granting of planning permission for a separate application at the appeal site. The proposal would fill in a small gap between the garage and the house which is presently the width of the pedestrian access gate to the rear garden. As the proposal extends the garage on the side away from the street, it would maintain the view up Heycrofts View from the junction with Market Street.
 6. The height of the eaves and the ridge of the garage would be raised by around 1.25m and 1.5m respectively. Although this and the linking of the house and garage would create a bulkier form of development than exists currently, I consider that this would not be unduly so, and that the proposed garage would still be subservient to the main house and in proportion to the integral garages and houses elsewhere in the street. When viewed from the Heycroft View/ Market Street junction, the increase in the height of the garage would not be particularly noticeable in the street scene and thus not harmful to the character of the cul de sac entrance.
 7. I consider that the proposed Tudor treatment on the side elevation of the building would not make it any more prominent in these views and recognise that such treatment is a feature of some of the dwellings in the street. It would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
 8. I do consider that the two proposed dormer windows on the front elevation of the garage building would be in keeping in scale and design to those in the house.
 9. It is accepted that the garage already stands higher than the level of Elizabeth Street, but I consider that its increased width and height would not be overbearing on the street itself or on the passageway at the rear of the properties on Market Street. The side extension to the garage would not be visible from most of the length of Elizabeth Street and would in any case sit behind the existing boundary treatment separating the passageway and the garden of the appeal property. The pitched roof design would also help to reduce its impact and I consider that the building would not be unduly prominent from Elizabeth Street.
 10. I consider that the proposed development would accord with Policies 1, 23 and 24 of the Council's Core Strategy adopted November 2011, which seek to promote good design and encourage development which reflects local character and distinctiveness. These policies are broadly consistent with the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework, which require that planning should take account of the character of different areas and seek to secure high quality design. I also consider that the proposed development accords with the Council's approved Supplementary Planning Document called
-

Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties 2008 which encourages good design and developments which are compatible with their surroundings.

Conditions

11. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary as this provides certainty. I have imposed a condition specifying materials as this is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Mike Worden

INSPECTOR
