



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 August 2022

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B2355/D/22/3302514

11 Crawshaw Drive, Reedsholme, Rossendale, Lancashire, BB4 8PR

- 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 Jonathan Foxcroft against the decision of Rossendale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/0043, dated 21 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is 1st floor side extension to provide an additional bedroom as per attached plans.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - ii) whether the proposal would make adequate provision for parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. No 11 is a detached 2 storey dwelling finished in brick with a tile roof. It is in a residential area characterised by similar properties arranged around an amenity green space. The appeal property forms part of a short row of substantially matching properties between road junctions in a prominent elevated location. The row of properties have dual pitch roofs with single storey side extensions which, as built, appear to have been garages although some have been converted to living accommodation. Properties are set back from the street to a similar depth, albeit that the curve in the road results in stepped building lines. Overall, the area has a consistent and harmonious character and appearance.
4. The proposal would be a first floor extension above part of the existing single storey side extension. It would be the same height to the ridge as the host property, with a shallow set back from the main 2 storey elevation. The front roof slope would be continuous with the main roof. However, the rear roof slope would be steeply angled such that it would not be continuous with the main rear roof slope and the extension would be set back from the main rear elevation by several metres.

5. The extension would be subordinate to the host dwelling in terms of its scale. However, by virtue of the continuation of the main ridge line and front roof slope and its shallow set back from the front elevation, the proposal would not appear subservient to its host.
6. The neighbouring properties are only narrowly separated from one another at ground floor level. However, the absence of first floor development above the single storey side extensions mitigates the close spacing and it avoids the appearance of a cramped built environment. The first floor extension would significantly reduce the visual gap between neighbouring properties. The resulting terraced effect would be out of character with the rhythm and spacing of the surrounding built environment.
7. Notwithstanding the narrow spacing between properties, the stepped building lines would allow views of the side elevation of the proposal. The asymmetric pitched roof would be a conspicuous and discordant feature that would not relate well to its host or neighbouring properties. Taking into account its size, design and context, the proposal would disrupt the relative harmony of the group. It would not be sympathetic to its surroundings nor would it maintain a strong sense of place or add to the overall quality of the area.
8. The frontage already comprises hardstanding parking with limited garden planting. The need for increased offstreet parking provision, discussed below, would likely result in further losses of landscape planting and it would reduce opportunities for planting to screen or soften the proposal. While vegetation is temporary and it cannot be relied upon to screen unacceptable development from view, nevertheless an increase in the hard built environment would contribute to the adverse visual impact of the proposal.
9. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies HS9 and ENV1 of the Rossendale Local Plan 2019-2036 Adopted December 2021 (the LP). These require among other things that development should be high quality, that it should respect and be sympathetic to its surroundings and that it should safeguard and enhance the built environment. It would conflict with the Council's Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties Supplementary Planning Document Adopted June 2008 in relation to the importance of retaining gaps between properties where these make a positive contribution to local character and appearance. It would also conflict with the visual amenity and design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Parking provision

10. The proposal would create a 4 bed property. In accordance with the Council's parking standards, 3 parking spaces would need to be provided. However, the site plan appears to illustrate only the existing parking arrangement and it does not demonstrate that 3 offstreet parking spaces could be accommodated.
11. The information with the appeal does not seek to address nor overcome the concerns of the Highway Authority and the Council. While I am not aware of any specific highway safety or capacity issues in this area, nevertheless it has not been demonstrated that adequate parking provision could be achieved or that a lesser level of provision with overspill on street parking would be appropriate in this location. Moreover, the Highway Authority response, and the absence of plans, casts doubt on whether an adequate number of parking

spaces could be provided. Consequently, I am not satisfied this is a matter that could be dealt with by planning condition.

12. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not provide adequate parking provision for a 4 bed property. It would conflict with the requirements of LP Policy TR4 in relation to adopted parking standards, soft landscaping and permeable surfaces. In the absence of satisfactory parking arrangements, it would conflict with the aims of the Framework including in relation to design and creating places which minimise the scope for conflict between road users.

Other Matters

13. I understand that the appellant contacted his local councillor to appeal the decision. However, I am not aware of any interested party representations either supporting or objecting to the proposal. Therefore, this is not a matter that weighs in favour of the scheme.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict.
15. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR