



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2017

by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B2355/D/17/3174648

39 Heald Lane, Weir, Bacup, Lancashire OL13 8QU

- 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 Mick Bradbury against the decision of Rossendale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/0570, received by the Council on 13 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as "first floor extension to an existing semi-detached house, extension to be constructed over single storey living space (formerly garage)".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms one of a row of similar semi-detached houses which have relatively narrow gaps between each pair of dwellings. The properties all have what was originally a garage at the side that extends slightly forward of the main elevation of the house. A number of the dwellings have extended at first floor level above the garage, but in all cases the first floor extension is set back so it is contiguous with the main elevation of the house, and the small gap between the houses is maintained.
4. Detailed guidance on extensions is to be found in the *Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties Supplementary Planning Document (adopted June 2008)* (SPD). This indicates that generally first floor side extensions should be set back from the main frontage in order to prevent the loss of gaps between buildings, particularly where the gap between properties is important to the street scene.
5. The proposed first floor extension would project forward of the main front elevation the same distance as the garage and would have a separate pitch roof above it. In creating a two storey projecting element on the house, with a different roof profile, the extension would be a prominent feature both on the house, and in the street scene. As such, the extension would not be a

subservient or sympathetic addition to the house, and would dominate rather than complement the original dwelling as required by the SPD. Furthermore, its projection in front of the first floor building line would detract from the consistency along this side of the road that contributes to the area's character and appearance.

6. Whilst the appellant has suggested that the proposed design would help to define the gap between No 39 and the adjacent dwelling, in my opinion in projecting beyond the building line, the proposal would make the gap between the properties harder to discern.
7. I accept that the mature vegetation in some of the front gardens means that the complete row of dwellings cannot be seen. However, the limited vegetation in both the front garden of this and the adjoining property, and their location adjacent to a road junction, means that these properties are highly visible within the street scene. As a result the incongruous nature of the proposed extension would be particularly detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.
8. In support of the appeal my attention has been drawn to extensions on the properties on the opposite side of the road. However, whilst I do not know the full circumstances of these cases, I observed that there is little consistency in the design, or the roof profiles, of these dwellings. As such they do not form a precedent for what would be appropriate on this side of the street where the houses have a different and consistent design.
9. Overall, I consider that the proposed extension would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies 1, 23 and 24 of the *Rosendale Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted November 2011)* which, amongst other things, require that development should complement and enhance the surrounding area, respect and respond to the local character, and be compatible with its surroundings.
10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR