



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2019

by E Symmons BSc (Hons), MSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/D2320/D/19/3234458

33 Bogburn Lane, Coppull, Chorley PR7 5JF

- 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 Michael Appleton against the decision of Chorley Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00344/FULHH, dated 9 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey extension to the front to include a porch and W.C.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and street scene.

Reasons

Whether it is inappropriate development in the Green Belt

3. Paragraph 145 of The National Planning Policy Framework¹ (the Framework) states that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate, other than for several exceptions. The paragraph goes on to state that extensions should not represent a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. Policy HS5 of the Chorley Council Local Plan 2015² (Local Plan) supported by the Central Lancashire Rural Development Supplementary Planning Document 2012, seeks that extensions to existing buildings within the Green Belt should not exceed 50% of the original property volume. The proposal would construct an extension to the front of the dwelling. When taken in combination with other additions, the increase in volume of the original property would be less than 50%. Similarly, if the overall size of the proposal is considered it would not be a disproportionate addition above the size of the original building. Accordingly,

¹ February 2019.

² Chorley Council. Chorley Local Plan. Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document. Adopted July 2015.

the proposal would not conflict with Policy HS5 of the Local Plan or the Framework and would not be inappropriate development for the purposes of Green Belt policy.

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling which sits within a row of similar properties along the east side of Bogburn Lane. Originally the properties on this side of the road would have had flat fronts with no front extensions. This creates a strong front building line although most of the properties have extended forward of this in varying ways. There is another example of a full width front extension in the street which the Council states has a 1.6 metre projection. Properties on the west side of the street have a different design and layout and are therefore not comparable with the appeal property.
5. Policy HS5 of the Local Plan seeks that extensions are subservient to and respect the dwelling's design. The Householder Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (Householder SPD) states that front extensions will rarely be acceptable due to their effect upon the character and appearance of the property and the area. Additionally, and in general, the guidance goes on to say that extensions should be subservient to the dwelling. Exceptions to this are where there is no strong front building line.
6. The existing property's porch projects 1.37 metres being around 2.76 metres high. In contrast, the proposal would project by 2.15 metres and be 3.38 metres at its highest point. This would be a substantial increase in size and projection when compared with both the existing porch and with other front additions within the street. Additionally, the proposal would alter the front door position, moving it to the side elevation. This would conflict with the style of other properties in the street which have doors on the front elevation.
7. In conclusion, due to its height, mass and forward projection stretching across the full width of the property, in addition to the reconfigured front door position, the proposal would dominate the front of the property and appear as an incongruous addition. This would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the streetscape. The proposal would therefore conflict with policy HS5 of the Local Plan and with advice given within the Householder SPD.

Other Matters

8. The appellant states that the front extension is required to accommodate a downstairs toilet which, due to the appellants' age and their son's disability, would improve their living conditions. Although I have sympathy with this view, there is no evidence before me to suggest that any other options have been considered which would be more acceptable in planning terms. I therefore give this matter limited weight within my decision.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons stated above, the appeal is dismissed.

E Symmons

INSPECTOR