



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2017

by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/17/3180958

88 Norbreck Close, Great Sankey, Warrington WA5 2SX

- 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 Rosalyn Biggs against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2017/30528, dated 30 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is single and two storey extension at rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the living conditions of the occupants of 90 and 107 Norbreck Close.

Reasons

3. Sited on a relatively modern housing estate, the property is a detached two storey dwelling with integral garage to the front. The proposal is for a single and two storey extension at the rear of the dwelling. The two storey extension would occupy the entire rear elevation, projecting around 4m. The single storey proposal would be set in about 0.5m at either side of the two storey extension, projecting roughly 1m further into the rear garden.
4. The adjacent property to the east, 90 Norbreck Close, is separated by a pedestrian side access between both houses and a timber panelled fence. The proposal would be to the south west of No 90's rear elevation.
5. Due to the two storey height, the orientation and projection in close proximity to the neighbouring garden and rear windows; the proposal would have a dominant and oppressive effect. It would also result in some loss of sunlight, particularly in the afternoon and evening.
6. The property to the rear, 107 Norbreck Close, features a kitchen/dining window in the facing elevation, which by virtue of its use for dining could be reasonably classed as a 'habitable room'. Whether or not this is a secondary dining area, or that it was originally intended to be used as a kitchen only would not change its current use as a 'habitable room'.

7. The appeal property has an ample garden, and there is also a patio area between the rear boundary of the appeal site and the side elevation of No 107. However, the distance between properties would be reduced; and I consider that sufficient distance would not be retained to ensure that the proposal did not lead to any adverse living conditions for the occupants of No 107. Whilst there would be no significant loss of privacy, the reduction in space between dwellings would have an overbearing effect, adversely affecting outlook, particularly given the two storey height and overall bulk.

Other Matters

8. I noted the modest distance between the kitchen/dining window of the appeal property and 86 Norbreck Close. However, the properties were constructed with this relationship, and I do not find that it would provide sufficient justification to allow this proposal that, for the reasons set out above, would cause harm to neighbouring living conditions.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would have an adverse effect upon the living conditions of the occupants of 90 and 107 Norbreck Close. Consequently, the proposal conflicts with Policy QE6 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (July 2014), which seeks to ensure development would not lead to an adverse impact on the amenity of those currently occupying adjoining or nearby properties. I also find conflict with the Supplementary Planning Guidance - House Extensions (December 2003), in so far as it seeks to protect living conditions.
10. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR