



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2024

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E2340/D/23/3333485

339 Kings Causeway, Brierfield, Nelson BB9 0EZ

- 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 and Mrs E Baysal against the decision of Pendle Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 2023/0524/FUL dated 2 August 2023 was refused by notice dated 27 September 2023.
 - The application is for two storey extension to front and side to create an annexe.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the determination of this application a revised National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was published in December 2023. I have therefore determined this appeal in accordance with the revised provisions within the Framework.
3. The description of development has changed from that contained upon the Appellant's original application form. This is acknowledged in part E of the Appeal form. Nevertheless, I have determined to use the description as used by the Council as I consider this more concisely describes the development as is proposed.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area, with particular emphasis upon the host bungalow and the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of neighbours.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached bungalow within this largely late twentieth century suburban area. Kings Causeway is a steeply sloping road built high above the valley below. As a result, properties are somewhat staggered upwards along the hillside. At the appeal site this results in number 339 being raised slightly above the highway even though it is a true bungalow in design, form and scale. This change in level is particularly noticeable along the boundary of the adjoining road Weatherhill Crescent, where there is a significant banking up towards the ground level of the property's side elevation.

6. The bungalow sports two bay windows and now has an asymmetrical frontage with a third bay to its side. This would ordinarily lead me to the assumption that the bungalow had previously been extended in some way. Historic photographs of the bungalow prior to it being rendered in a pebble dash aesthetic would potentially support this.
7. Despite this, the proposal before me would create a substantial annexe to the side of the existing bungalow. In so doing the front door would be moved between the bays and a new doorway would serve a rendered three storey extension that would present a gable towards the streetscene.
8. In assessing this appeal I am aware of the Council's Policy ENV2 of the Core Strategy Local Plan Part 1 (CS) which seeks to ensure a high quality of new design that is reflective of context and attractive to look at. This policy not only reflects The Framework but is also supported by the Design Principles Supplementary Planning Document (DPD) which provides more detail on the requirements for residential extensions to existing dwellinghouses.
9. This guidance is clear that extensions should appear generally subordinate to the host property as well as maintaining space around dwellings and echoing fenestration patterns where they exist. This is often also typical of the general approach to annexes themselves, where they are, by definition almost, subservient to their host building.
10. The proposal before me would however somewhat turn this guidance on its head in so much as it would seek to create an annexe that would thoroughly dominate the existing bungalow and the associated streetscene with a much larger extension that would be clearly dominant. This would not only fail in any attempt to be subordinate, but it would also create a very awkward juxtaposition between the roof forms here and would not, to my mind, appear as an annexe in any way.
11. Whereas the existing bungalow sports a symmetrical, hipped roof, so characteristic of mid 20th century bungalows of this type, the proposal here would abruptly stop this roof form before extending to a much higher gabled form facing directly upon the street. The proposed extension would also protrude forward of the existing bungalow and as such any sense of subordination would be completely absent.
12. It is not only this lack of subordination however that is of concern here, as the proposed extension would introduce fenestration that would fail to respond to the host bungalow in terms of proportion or design and the extension itself would lack any distinct architectural quality. As a result, I consider that the extension would be wholly unattractive to look at.
13. When assessing too the proximity to the immediate neighbour, I find that such a high extension would contribute somewhat to an overdominance upon the relationship between these two properties both in terms of the relationship visually within the streetscene and the impact upon the living conditions of residents here. Although the side window to number 341 appears to be a secondary window, the proximity and height of the proposed extension would still undermine its function of giving light into the house, even if this was to circulation areas.

14. Ultimately, despite the Appellant's discourse that the neighbouring property, and other properties nearby, have been extended thus, I fail to see how any such examples locally have undertaken a scheme that is quite so harmful or unresponsive to context as this one.
15. As such I consider that there would be a fundamental conflict with this proposal and the requirements of Policy ENV2 of the Core Strategy Local Plan Part 1 as well as the recommendations within the Council's Residential Design SPD and the emphasis upon good design as advanced through The Framework. As such this appeal must fail.

Other Matter

16. The Appellant has advanced the possibility that the existing bungalow could potentially be demolished and a new, larger and higher property could be created in its place. Even were this to be a sustainable fall back position I have no evidence before me as to the likely acceptability of this course of action by the Council nor does it form any part of the appeal before me other than the theoretical situation as outlined. As such I am unable to give this possibility any weight as a fallback position in determining this appeal.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR