
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2017

by Philip Major BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H4315/D/17/3168586

56 Langholm Road, Ashton in Makerfield WN4 0SG.

- 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 P Lafferty for Miss A Pidgeon against the decision of St. Helens Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: P/2016/0691/HHFP, dated 14 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a front conservatory.
-

Preliminary Matter

1. The appeal has been made in the name of Mr P Lafferty. The application was made erroneously in the name of Mr & Mrs Pidgeon. I am informed that this was a mistake and that the application would more correctly have been made in the name of Mr P Lafferty and Miss A Pidgeon, joint owners of the property. I am content that the mistake made at application stage has been rectified and that there is no prejudice in my determining the appeal in the name of Mr P Lafferty.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site forms a prominent corner plot at the entrance to Langholm Road, and although the dwelling is partially screened by vegetation there are clear views of the front elevation from the street. Furthermore the vegetation could be removed at any time, resulting in the front of house being wholly open to view.
 5. In this context I am concerned that the design of the proposed front extension would not sit comfortably with the existing building. The dwelling is of relatively simple design and forms a pair with its semi-detached partner. The large forward projecting extension would destroy the symmetry of the pair and would add an incongruous element to the house. The scale, form and design of the extension would be at odds with the dwelling and would stand out as a
-

visually jarring element both in relation to the house itself, and in relation to the wider area. The form of the glazed roof proposed would add a further discordant feature since the dwellings in the locality have tiled roofs which give greater visual strength than a glazed roof could offer. I do not agree with the Appellant that the extension would be a sympathetic addition to the house.

6. Saved Policy Gen 8 of the St Helens Unitary Development Plan (UDP) expects that development will respect the scale, design, character and appearance of the original dwelling, as well as respecting the character of the local setting. In my judgement the proposed development would fail to comply with those expectations and it is consequently in conflict with the development plan.
7. Guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on householder development gives further guidance and states that front extensions should be subordinate to the original dwelling. In this case the extension would be a large and dominant feature and could not be regarded as subordinate. Hence the design of the extension also conflicts with the SPD advice.
8. I have noted the examples of other side and front developments in the locality. I do not know the full details surrounding the building of any of them. In any case none of these examples seems to me to be as intrusive or damaging to the host building or the general locality as would be the case with the extension proposed here.
9. I understand the Appellant's desire to provide more living space, but cannot agree that this proposal is an acceptable method of providing that space. I recognise the fact that there is only a small rear garden which might restrict the opportunity to build there, but this does not outweigh the fundamental harm which would be caused to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the locality, and the conflict with the development plan, which I have identified.
10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Major

INSPECTOR