



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 December 2020

by R Hitchcock BSc(Hons) DipCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D2320/D/20/3261078

27 Preston Road, Whittle-Le-Woods PR6 7PE

- 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 J Ingham and Ms J Warren against the decision of Chorley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00578/FULHH, dated 12 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension with single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. At the time of my site inspection, some works had taken place on the site. For the avoidance of doubt, I have considered the appeal based on the proposals as shown on the plans considered by the Council.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at 29 Preston Road with particular regard to outlook, enclosure and light.

Reasons

4. The site lies within a staggered row of residential properties of individually designed semi-pairs to the western side of Preston Road. The dwelling at 27 Preston Road is south of that at the neighbouring property at No29, which is set forward of in its plot. The plans indicate that the gap between the buildings is some 4.23m with a brick boundary wall separating a pedestrian access to the side of No29 from the appeal site.
5. The proposal would incorporate a two-storey side extension behind a shallow single storey projection which would be set off the front elevation of the dwelling. The rear of the two-storey element would terminate at the line of the existing rear elevation where it would drop to a single storey with a mono-pitched roof over. The development would extend sideways to just short of the common boundary and be completed in matching materials.
6. No29 incorporates 3 window openings in its side elevation facing the appeal site. These consist of a high level window to a single storey rear extension and ground floor and first floor windows just rear of mid-gable. According to the

- neighbour's submissions, the ground floor gable window serves a habitable kitchen and dining room and is the only window serving that room. The window is not significant in size, however, it is south facing such that it benefits from some direct sunlight and good levels of ambient daylight.
7. The proposed extensions would partially overlap with the outlook from the ground floor gable window, as the existing building does. However, it would be at a much closer distance such that it would become significantly more dominant and close down the aspect of the outward view. This would result in an overbearing form of development and give rise to poor outlook.
 8. Although morning light would be largely unaffected, the close proximity and height of the extension would obstruct much of the direct sunlight beneficial to the dark interior of the neighbour's ground floor room during afternoon and evening hours. The closeness and scale of the two-storey flank elevation of the extension would also reduce ambient daylight that would further darken the room.
 9. Although the first-floor window of No29 would be set almost directly opposite the two-storey extension, the effect on light would be less pronounced on account of its higher position and the hipped form of the proposed roof. However, the closer proximity of the forward corner of the side wall and roofscape would dominate the outlook. Whilst this would not be overbearing on account of the extent of visible sky and angled roof slope, it would, nevertheless, cause a notable adverse impact on the outlook from the first-floor window.
 10. Due to the high level nature of the side window to the rear extension of No29 and presence of double glazed door and side lights in the rear, the effect of the proposal on outlook and light would be limited within that room. I note the concerns of the neighbour in the transmission of light through that extension into a utility room, however, as a non-habitable room this is a matter of negligible weight. No undue overlooking of the neighbouring properties would result.
 11. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposed extension would result in significant adverse effects through its imposition on the outward aspect of the gable windows and loss of direct sunlight and daylight to the ground floor gable window. It would thereby conflict with Policies HS5 and BNE1 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2015) as they seek to protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Other Matters

12. I acknowledge that the appellant has sought to work with the Council to resolve identified concerns and provide a complimentary design of development. However, this and the absence of objections from the Parish Council and other third parties are not benefits in favour of the development.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, the appeal should be dismissed.

R Hitchcock INSPECTOR