



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2020

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D2320/D/20/3250074

2 Brookfield Lane, Clayton-Le-Woods PR6 7FG

- 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 Michelle Parkin against the decision of Chorley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01074/FULHH, dated 11 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is first floor living accommodation over existing detached double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling on Brookfield Lane which is characterised by similar modern two storey dwellings. The property is located near to the junction of Brookfield Lane and Sandy Lane. To the side of the dwelling is a detached pitched roof double garage that abuts the boundary with 4 Brookfield Lane. The garage is set forward of the building line of Nos 2 and 4 and has a drive to the front.
4. Policy HS5 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 – 2026 (Local Plan) states that permission will be granted for the extension of dwellings provided that criteria a) to d) are satisfied. The Council do not raise any concern with the proposal's compliance with criterion b) to d). I agree. Criterion a) requires the extension to respect the existing house and the surrounding buildings in terms of scale, size, design and facing materials, without innovative and original design features being stifled.
5. The existing garage offers a lower scale transition between Nos 2 and 4 and thus a visual relief at first floor level between the otherwise two storey-built form around the entrance to Brookfield Lane. A similar effect is created by the garage between 3 and 5 Brookfield Lane, albeit this garage is set back from these dwellings. A large proportion of properties in Brookfield Lane, Hazel Close and Fir Tree Grove have integral garages and not detached garages.

6. The proposed development would increase the scale of the garage and largely infill the space that currently affords a visual break at first floor level between Nos 2 and 4. The proposal's design and appearance closely follows that of examples at 23, 24 and 25 Fir Tree Grove. However, Nos 23, 24 and 25 are set back a considerable distance from their respective hosts and in a cul-de-sac. The proposal would have a different effect on the character and appearance of the area due to the site's prominent location. Insofar as the proposal itself, the design and appearance of the development would take cues from nearby properties in terms of the proposed use of materials. However, the proposal would be a dominant form of development due to its scale and proximity to Nos 2 and 4 that would erode the visual relief between the dwellings near to the junction of Brookfield Lane and Sandy Lane. I consider the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area in this regard.
7. I understand that the existing garage has no roof on one side and I recognise the appellant's efforts to pro-actively engage with the Council with a view to finding a solution in the form of revised plans. While the Council's response has taken time, these matters do not alter or outweigh the harm that I have identified in respect of the scheme that is before me.
8. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposed development would lead to a significant effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would conflict with Local Plan Policy HS5 which requires the extension to respect the existing house and the surrounding buildings in terms of scale, size, design, without innovative and original design features being stifled. The proposal would also not accord with the Council's Householder Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document as it would erode the space between Nos 2 and 4 which would upset the established character.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR