



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2022

by J D Clark BA (Hons) DpTRP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/22/3306206

Coppersend, 21 Whalley Road, Wilpshire, BB1 9LQ

- 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 Ingleby against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2022/0543, dated 6 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is construction of new two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of new two storey rear extension at Coppersend, 21 Whalley Road, Wilpshire, BB1 9LQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/2022/0543, dated 6 June 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - *Drawing Nos: 001 & 002 Rev D*
 - 3) The brickwork and roofing materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached building and the land around it and appears to have been sub-divided into three properties, 21, 21A and 21B. The building is complex in its design and includes single storey, two-storey and three-storey elements and a variety of roof profiles. The land drops steeply to the rear with steps leading down to a much lower garden area and a number of outbuildings.
4. The area comprises a mix of properties with no-one design dominating its character. For example, there are traditional stone built terraced houses opposite, on the eastern, side of the road, but those on the western side, including the appeal site are more varied. These include commercial properties including those adjacent to the appeal site. Both of the nearest properties

either side of the appeal site have extensions of various forms and appearance. To the south-west there is a pair of two-storey, traditionally designed, semi-detached houses, 17 and 19 Whalley Road sited at a lower level than No 21 and at right angles to it. The mix of building styles, sizes and ages, together with various additions and alterations have created a characteristic mix of property types, especially on the western side of Whalley Road.

5. Due to the difference in levels and the space between the appeal site and the adjacent property to the south, 15 Whalley Road, the extension would be visible from the road and from surrounding properties, including from a path that runs close to the southern boundary of the appeal site to 17 and 19 Whalley Road and a further gated access beyond.
6. However, whilst the extension would be visible from the public realm it would be set back considerably from the front of the property and due to the drop in land levels, it would not appear unduly prominent or conspicuous. It would be seen from surrounding properties but due to the existing design of the building, the different levels of the various components to it and the varied roof profile, it would not appear out of place in this context. Furthermore, I do not consider that it would appear dominant, again due to the multiple levels of the property and the fact that the extension would be lower than the highest part of the building. The extension itself would also be relatively modest in proportion to the overall scale of the building.
7. I do not therefore consider that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and would not therefore conflict with the design criteria set out in Local Plan¹ Policy DMG1. It would also not conflict with Policy DMH5 which, amongst other things, requires residential extensions to accord with Policy DMG1.

Other Matters

8. I have considered the effect of the extension on the living conditions of neighbouring residential properties 17 and 19 Whalley Road. This pair of semi-detached houses are at a lower level than the appeal site and so the extension would be clearly visible from them. However, given the distance between the extension at No 21 and Nos 17 and 19 and their positions in relation to the appeal site, I do not consider that the occupiers of Nos 17 and 19 would be likely to experience any undue overlooking or loss of privacy.
9. Whilst the neighbours at Nos 17 and 19 may currently experience noise from No 21 in relation to music or talking, which I appreciate may be enhanced due to the elevated position of No 21, I do not consider that the proposal would be likely to worsen this situation to such a degree to justify withholding planning permission.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested conditions which I have considered in the light of the Planning Practice Guidance². A condition requiring the materials to match the existing building is suggested but the plans indicate that part of the development would be cement rendered. However, other than this, it is

¹ Ribble Valley Borough Council – Core Strategy 2008 – 2028 A Local Plan for Ribble Valley Adoption Version, Adopted 16 December 2014.

² Planning practice Guidance. Published 6 March 2014 – Updated 23 July 2019.

necessary that the brickwork and roofing materials match the existing building in order to achieve a satisfactory appearance. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of clarity, a condition is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, and having had regard to the development plan and all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR