
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2017

by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D2320/D/17/3181376
46 Mavis Drive, Coppull PR7 5AF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Paul Holland against the decision of Chorley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00302/FULHH, dated 16 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 23 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is front and rear single storey extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the single storey front extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 46 Mavis Drive, Coppull PR7 5AF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/00302/FULHH, dated 16 March 2017, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and 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 approved plan PCE-Holland-March-17-Planning.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials to match the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matter

2. For the reasons that follow, I find the proposed single storey rear extension to be acceptable and clearly severable both physically and functionally from the proposed single storey front extension. Therefore, I intend to issue a split decision in this case and grant planning permission for the single storey rear extension.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The dwelling is a semi-detached two storey building. Despite the property being re-skinned with brick, it sits within a row of 8 very similarly designed

dwelling, set in 4 pairs, with dual pitched roofs, brick walls and a simple, flat and understated frontage. The 2 middle pairs sit very slightly forward of the 2 outer blocks. The area has a sub-urban residential character and there are a variety of house types in the surrounding street.

5. The proposal is for a single storey front and single storey rear extension. The front extension will have two different mono-pitched roof slopes, one part projecting around 2m and the other projecting around 3m. The extension would occupy the majority of the front elevation and given the existing simple design, would drastically alter the visual appearance of the dwelling. The single storey rear extension would project around 4m, having a mono-pitched roof and spanning the rear elevation.
6. The front garden of the dwelling is not particularly deep, and is bounded by low height timber boundary fencing, being relatively open to the street. Whilst I note the appellant's intentions to bring character to the dwelling and soften the front elevation; the projection, width and scale of the proposal, particularly the larger kitchen section, would appear unduly prominent and incongruous, adversely affecting the simple architectural rhythm of the host dwelling and the row of properties in which it is located.
7. I have no evidence before me that the proposal would project no further forward than No 44. On the contrary, from my observations on the site visit, the 'kitchen' section would project forward of No 44, contributing to its dominance and discordancy in the street.
8. Therefore, the proposal would fail to respect the existing dwelling, unduly affect the building lines in the street and have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area. Consequently the proposal conflicts with Policy HS5 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (July 2015) (DPD). This policy seeks to ensure that, amongst other things, house extensions will respect the existing house and the character and appearance of the area. I also find conflict with the Householder Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (January 2017) (SPD), which seeks high quality residential design.
9. The single storey rear extension is less prominent due to its location at the rear. It would have an acceptable effect upon neighbouring living conditions and is of a scale, size and design that would respect the host dwelling. Accordingly, the single storey rear extension would have an acceptable effect upon the character and appearance of the area, in compliance with Policy HS5 of the DPD and the SPD.

Other Matters

10. I have very little information about 58 Mavis Drive. However, the property is set within a different context, not located in a row of comparable dwellings. Thus, I draw very little similarities to the appeal case before me. Furthermore, each proposal is required to be considered upon its own merits and that is what I have done here.
11. The appellant details that the single storey rear extension can be constructed under permitted development. I have no information regarding whether or not this has been granted prior approval; and as I have found this element of the proposal acceptable, nothing turns on this matter.

Conclusion

12. With regards to the single storey rear extension, to ensure certainty I shall attach a condition requiring that development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Additionally, in order to ensure the extension harmonises with the host dwelling, a condition requiring the external materials to match those used in the property is required.
13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension and dismissed insofar as it relates to the single storey front extension.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR