
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2022 by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D2320/D/22/3294489

30 High Bank, Heapey, Chorley PR6 9AY

- 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 Joe Allman against the decision of Chorley Borough Council.
 - The application, ref. 21/01170/FULHH, dated 29 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'complete replacement of roof to create living accommodation within roof space, and associated alterations'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issues to be considered are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and the effect of the proposal on parking provision.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The area surrounding the appeal site is residential in character with the street scene formed of two storey dwellings adjacent to, but set back from, the highway. There is a variation in the design and materials of these dwellings. Nonetheless, there is a consistency in the scale and proportions of groups of dwellings, affording the street scene an agreeable rhythm. There is an absence of development to the south of the appeal property, forming a visual end to the group of dwellings along this side of the highway.
5. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling with a pitched roof and front gable. Despite some minor variation in design and materials between the appeal property and the adjacent dwelling, there is a similarity in their scale and particularly the modest proportions of the roof due to the shallow pitch. The absence of development on the opposite side of the appeal site means that the appeal site is seen as the last in a row of similarly proportioned properties,

before a change to a different style of housing on Tormore Close and Black Brook Close. Although those other properties have steeper pitched roofs, their roofs are nevertheless in proportion to the walls, therefore they maintain a consistent appearance with each other, markedly different to that of the appeal property and its group of similar dwellings on the other side of the road. Consequently, the similarities between the appeal property and the adjacent dwelling create an important visual relationship within the context of the street scene.

6. The proposed development would substantially raise the existing ridge line whilst maintaining the height of the eaves. The resultant development would drastically alter the scale and proportions of the host dwelling, such that the roof would appear out of proportion with the rest of the dwelling. Consequently, it would have a negative impact on the character of the host property.
7. In this prominent location, the creation of a large expanse of roof on the front elevation would introduce a dominant and incongruous feature when viewed from the public realm, to the detriment of the character of the existing street scene. The negative impact would be exacerbated when viewed with the far more modest and well-proportioned adjacent dwelling, where the difference in height and proportions would be jarring and harmful.
8. The incorporation of solar panels and rooflights and the inclusion of a side window would be normal features in a residential area and these elements, in isolation, would not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling or area.
9. Nevertheless, for the above reasons I conclude that the proposed replacement of the roof would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Accordingly, I find the proposal would conflict with Policy HS5 of the Chorley Local Plan (2015) (Local Plan) which requires extensions to respect the existing house and surrounding buildings in terms of scale, size and design.
10. It would also conflict with the guidance in the Householder Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which sets out that increasing the height of a dwelling by amending the roof pitch will significantly affect the character and proportions of the building.

Parking Provision

11. The proposal would create a single additional bedroom, resulting in a 5-bedroom dwelling, but would not reduce the existing level of parking provision on the appeal site. The Council's Parking Standards relate to dwellinghouses with 4+ bedrooms. There is no additional requirement for parking provision between a 4-bedroom and a 5-bedroom dwelling. Consequently, the proposal would not result in a need for additional parking based on the Council's Parking Standards.
12. Policy ST4 of the Local Plan requires that parking provision below the standards is supported by evidence detailing the local circumstances that justify deviation. During my site visit I observed there were no parking restrictions in the area and ample on-street parking available. There was no evidence of parking congestion within the area. Whilst I recognise that my site visit

represents a snapshot in time, my observations broadly reflect those described by the appellant.

13. Consequently, while I have limited information on the availability of sustainable transport options, I do not consider that the proposal would require additional parking provision to be made, or that continued provision below standard would result in any harm. Therefore, I find no conflict with Local Plan Policy ST4 or the SPD in this respect.

Other Matters

14. The installation of solar panels to the roof slope would result in benefits through the provision of a small-scale renewable energy project, which make a valuable contribution to tackling climate change and are supported by local and national policy. Even at this small scale, this is a matter which I give modest weight. However, I give great weight to the harm to the character and appearance of the property and area which would result from the proposal, and its consequent conflict with the development plan. Therefore, these benefits would not outweigh the harm I have identified.
15. The appellant has cited a planning approval within the area to raise the ridge height of an existing dwelling. Based on the plans submitted by the appellant the approved increase in ridge height was approximately 0.4 metres. This is substantially less than that of the appeal proposal and did not alter the character and proportions of that dwelling to the degree proposed here. Therefore, the effect of that scheme was not comparable to the appeal before me and does not justify the harm I have identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and agree with the recommendation, and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR