



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2023

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/23/3319827

77 Ribchester Road, Wilpshire, Lancashire BB1 9HT

- 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 Steve Grunshaw against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
- The application Ref 3/2022/1073, dated 9 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 February 2023.
- The development proposed is a two storey side and single storey rear extension to a semi detached dwelling.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on (i) the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at 75 Ribchester Road with regard to daylight and outlook, and (ii) the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

3. The two-storey part of the proposal would be situated to the side of the existing two storey section of the building and would extend close to the common boundary with No. 75. This neighbouring property has a number of windows that face the appeal site, including a side-facing window that the Council has identified is the only source of daylight to a habitable room. Given the proposal would bring a two-storey addition closer to the side elevation of No. 75, it would result in a harmful loss of daylight and an unacceptable overbearing impact.
4. The two-storey extension would have a single storey element to the rear that would be adjoined to an existing outbuilding. This would present an elongated side elevation close to the common boundary with No. 75. However, given the height of the single storey element of the proposal, and the existing boundary treatment that I was able to see at the time of my visit, as well as outbuildings in No. 75's garden, I do not consider that the single storey element of the proposed development would result in an undue loss of outlook.
5. Nevertheless, I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable harmful impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at 75 Ribchester Road with regard to daylight and outlook. As such, it would conflict with Policy DMG1

of the Core Strategy 2008-2028 A Local Plan for Ribble Valley (Core Strategy), which seeks, amongst other matters, for development to not adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) which seeks at paragraph 130, a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Character and Appearance

6. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling which is situated amongst a group of similar dwellings that are set back from the road, behind front garden and parking areas. Each pair of properties are mostly separated by driveways and there is a general consistency to the design of such dwellings in terms of hipped roofs and the presence of two storey front bays. These provide for a pleasant order and spaciousness to the patten of development which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The two-storey side extension has been amended so that it would be setback at first floor level from the front elevation of the existing dwelling and have a lower roof ridgeline. Whilst this would differentiate the extension from the existing host property, it would nevertheless introduce built form close to the common side boundary with No. 75. Although the neighbouring property has not been extended to the side, this development would alter the regular pattern of spaces between the houses, and the closing of the gap could give rise to a terracing effect when seen along Ribchester Road. The Council has raised concerns on views of the proposal from Showley Court. However, whilst the development would be visible from public vantage points to the rear of the appeal site, given that much of the development is single storey, it would not appear over dominant in such views.
8. The appellant has made reference to nearby examples of similar two storey side extensions. A number of these show two storey extensions on adjoining properties that are situated close to each other. These however do little to support the proposal and serve to demonstrate the harm that could be caused by the terracing effect.
9. I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. As such, it would conflict with Policy DMG1 of the Core Strategy, which seeks, amongst other matters, a high standard of building design and development which considers visual appearance and the relationship to surroundings. It would also be contrary to Paragraph 130 of the Framework which seeks development that is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has made reference to suggested amendments by the Council during the consideration of the application that is subject of this appeal by them, including setting the two-storey side extension away from the common boundary with No. 75. This appeal however follows the Council's formal decision, and I can confirm that I have dealt with it accordingly on its own merits.
11. I have also taken account of the extension which was under construction at No. 81 which the appellant considers sets a precedence for the appeal proposal. I have been provided with limited details of this extension; however,

the Council has set out that the circumstances differed in terms of the relationship that No. 81 had with its neighbouring property, which had a side-facing window but benefits from a dual aspect. I have determined this appeal on its individual planning merits, taking into account the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. This and other examples of nearby development do not alter my findings in respect of the main issues.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having taken account of the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR