



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2022

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1ST February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B2355/D/21/3286258

11 Grasmere Road, Haslingden, BB4 4EB

- 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 Luke Brandwood against the decision of Rossendale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/0408, dated 30 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing side garage and erection of a two-storey side extension (incorporating garage) and a single-storey extension across rear. Existing house to be externally repaired and refurbished.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of both the appeal property and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a relatively large garden, which is situated in a residential area. The character and appearance of the area is mixed in terms of dwelling types, age and appearance. However, the appeal property is situated in a row of semi-detached dwellings where a distinctive characteristic is the double drive-width gap between dwellings at first-floor level. This gives the streetscene a spacious appearance at this point.
4. It is also evident that a number of properties in the locality have been extended and altered, some of which have been referred to in the appellant's Grounds of Appeal and Character Study. The appellant considers that they are comparable with the appeal proposal. Whilst that may be the case, it is not for me to comment on the Council's reasoning in respect of these other examples and I am required to determine the appeal on its individual merits.
5. The proposal is to demolish an existing garage and construct a two-storey side extension and a single-storey rear extension. The side extension would have a hipped-roof and would be set back slightly from the front wall of the original dwelling. In terms of its roof design and the use of matching materials, I accept that the proposal would reflect the appearance of the existing building. The single-storey flat-roofed rear extension would be built across most of the

full width of the existing property and the side extension (some 9.4m) and it would be 4m deep.

6. Policies 1, 23 and 24 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy (CS) generally seek to ensure that new developments enhance the local area; are of high quality design; and are compatible with their surroundings. In addition, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties seeks to prevent the loss of gaps between buildings in order to avoid a terracing effect. It also states that single-storey rear extensions should not normally project in excess of 3m from the rear wall of the property.
7. The policies of the CS and relevant provisions of the SPD are consistent with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework), which also requires developments to add to the overall quality of the area; be visually attractive; and be sympathetic to local character.
8. Although the appeal property sits at an angle with the neighbouring dwelling at number 15 Grasmere Road, the proposed side extension would result in the narrowing of the existing space at first-floor level between the appeal property and number 15. It would not create a terrace but, in my opinion, the reduction in space, particularly towards the front of the property, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the streetscene. Furthermore, the minimal set-back from the existing front wall of the dwelling would accentuate the narrowing of the gap and would result in the extension having a bulky and overly dominant appearance, which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
9. With regard to the rear single storey extension, whilst it would be large, I am not persuaded that it would be unduly harmful, given that it would not be visible from Grasmere Road and it would not result in an overdevelopment of the plot.
10. In reaching my decision, I have given weight to the appellant's desire to improve the quality and layout of the accommodation. I also note that the proposal has been amended on several occasions in an attempt to overcome the Council's concerns. However, this does not outweigh my findings.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of both the appeal property and the streetscene. Accordingly, it would conflict with the Development Plan and with the provisions of the Framework, as referred to above.
12. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR