



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2024

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D2320/D/23/3332463

22 Firbank, Euxton, Lancashire PR7 6HP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Nicola Forshaw against the decision of Chorley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/00534/FULHH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. This appeal concerns a two-storey detached dwelling which is located within a large, open-plan residential estate that is characterised by properties of a similar design and appearance. As such, the area has a strong suburban character.
4. The proposed side extension would be narrower than the footprint of the existing garage. Nevertheless, it would remain a substantial and prominent addition to the host property due to its generous width, lack of set down ridge and projection forward of the dwelling across two storeys. The proposal also includes a two-storey front entrance projection.
5. Whilst front projections to other properties within the wider housing estate are a common design feature, by virtue of the collective significant massing and bulky design of the front and side extensions, the proposed alterations would be overly dominant and incongruous additions to the host property.
6. Further, along with significant alterations to the fenestration of the entire property, rather than modernising what is described as a bland property frontage, the appeal proposal would result in a dwelling which would be in stark contrast to the clear architectural style in the streetscape. It would therefore contribute towards the erosion of the suburban character of the area.
7. My attention has been drawn to extensions and alterations at 27 and 29 Firbank and I observed these at the time of my site visit. However, the appellant advises that there is no record of planning permission for No 29. Additionally, I do not have the full details of the example at No 27 before me.

Nonetheless, this example serves to confirm my concerns with the incongruous design and significant massing of the appeal proposal as described above. Moreover, each proposal should be considered on its own merits.

8. Accordingly, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and thus would conflict with Policy HS5 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 (July 2015) which requires extensions to respect the existing house and the surrounding buildings, amongst other things.

Conclusion

9. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should not succeed.

H Ellison

INSPECTOR