
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2017

by I Jenkins BSc CEng MICE MCIWEM

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

Decision date: 6 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2315/W/16/3165793

Musty Haulgh Farm Cottage, Granville Street, Brierfield, Burnley, BB10 2RA

- 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 Jake Cosgrove against the decision of Burnley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/2016/0321, dated 3 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension and detached double garage with new access road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension and detached double garage with new access road at Musty Haulgh Farm Cottage, Granville Street, Brierfield, Burnley, BB10 2RA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. APP/2016/0321, dated 3 August 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: Site plan scale 1:200 (received 19 July 2016), red/blue edged plan (received 3 July 2016), red/blue edged plan (received 19 July 2016); plans and elevations as existing drawing no. 16-05-01 (received 19 July 2016); plans as proposed drawing no. 16-05-02 A (received 19 July 2016); and, elevations as proposed drawing no. 16-05-03 (received 19 July 2016), except in respect of the details shown on the approved plans of the openings within the northern, eastern and southern elevations of the extension to the dwelling hereby approved.
 - 3) No development shall take place until details of the openings within the northern, eastern and southern elevations of the extension to the dwelling hereby approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) Notwithstanding condition no. 2, the materials used in the external surfaces of the extension to the dwelling and detached double garage hereby approved shall match those used in the surfaces of the existing dwelling.
-

Main Issues

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character of the appeal property and the appearance of the locality and the rural area.

Reasons

3. Musty Haulgh Farm Cottage (MHFC) forms part of a pair of semi-detached houses, which together with a small group of other buildings is situated in the countryside. The front elevation of the semi-detached pair faces in a northerly direction across a shared parking area and the ridge line of the pitched roof of the 2-storey elements of the 2 dwellings runs in an east/west direction. A single-storey annexe projects from the two-storey front wall of MHFC and extends part way across the two-storey front wall of the neighbouring dwelling, which is much wider than that of the appeal property. The ridge line of the pitched roof of that annexe is parallel to that of the main roof. MHFC also has a conservatory to the side and another to the rear.
4. The proposal includes the removal of the side conservatory and the erection of a 2-storey side extension adjoining the 2-storey gable and single-storey annexe of MHFC. The proposal would add significantly to the width of the frontage of the appeal property. As a result, it would be broadly comparable to the width of the frontage of the adjoining dwelling and in this respect the pair would have a more balanced appearance. Unlike the existing property, the proposed extension would have a front gable with a ridge line running in a north/south direction. However, the roof would be pitched and its ridge and eaves levels would match those of the existing main roof. Although the proposed extension would alter the appearance of MHFC, I consider that the scale, form and proportions of the proposed extension would complement the existing dwelling.
5. The style of the proposed window openings shown on the application plans is ambiguous. Whilst on the 'elevations as proposed' drawing the window openings are shown sub-divided by mullions, the majority of the openings shown on the 'plans as proposed' drawing are not. The mullion style of opening is not in keeping with the existing simple style of window opening. As a result, it would appear awkward, giving an impression of poor design which would be unacceptable. However, it would be possible to ensure that the style of the proposed window openings would match that of the existing semi-detached pair through the imposition of a condition requiring details to be submitted to the Council for approval. In the same way, the details of the ground floor openings within the northern elevation of the proposed extension, which have been shown on the 'plans as proposed' drawing and omitted from the 'elevations as proposed' drawing could be clarified and controlled. Furthermore, it would be possible to ensure that the materials used in the external surfaces of the proposed extension would match those of the existing building through the imposition of a suitable condition. The stone quoin detailing at the corners of the proposed extension would be in keeping with the stonework of the existing annexe. I consider that, subject to conditions, the style of the proposed extension would be acceptable as would its overall effect on the character of MHFC.

6. The proposal also includes the erection of a pitched roof double garage within the side garden of the dwelling with an adjoining area of hardstanding and a new driveway leading northwards to intersect the existing shared access to the 2 properties. Neither the Highway Authority nor the Council has objected to these elements of the scheme and I have no reason to do so.
7. Views of the proposed development from public vantage points would be limited, due to the relatively isolated location of the group of which it forms part and the planting in the locality. It would not have a material impact on the visual amenity of the locality or the rural area.
8. I conclude overall that, subject to conditions, the effect of the proposal on the character of the appeal property and the appearance of the locality and rural area would be acceptable. Furthermore, it would accord with the requirements of Policies H13, GP3 and GP2 of the *Burnley Local Plan Second Review, 2006*, which seek between them to ensure that the proposal: is in keeping with the existing house and surrounding buildings; would not adversely affect the visual amenity of the locality or the surrounding landscape; and, would amount to good design, which is in keeping with the aims of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework).

Other matters

9. I understand that residents of the dwelling adjoining MHFC consider that the appearance of the proposed extension would be acceptable and they have no objections to the submitted plans. This adds further weight to my conclusion on the main issue. The Council has indicated that, contrary to the neighbour's suggestion, it would not be reasonable to seek to restrict the number of vehicles that could be parked at the appeal site in association with the use of the property as a dwelling. Furthermore, if in future it was thought that a business was being run from the premises, enforcement action could be taken. I have no reason to disagree.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested 2 conditions which it considers should be imposed in the event of planning permission being granted. In addition to the normal commencement condition, a condition would be necessary, in the interests of clarity, to ensure that the works would be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, subject to other conditions. In my judgement, conditions would also be required, in the interests of visual amenity, to control the materials used in the external surfaces of the proposed extension and garage as well as details of the openings in the elevations of the proposed extension.

Conclusions

11. I conclude overall, that the scheme would amount to sustainable development under the terms of the Framework and it would not conflict with the Development Plan. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

I Jenkins

INSPECTOR