



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2024

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D2320/D/24/3340621

151 Preston Road, Chorley, Lancashire PR7 5DR

- 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 Joseph McKay against the decision of Chorley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01090/FULHH.
 - The development proposed is building of timber summer house/ shed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for building of timber summer house/ shed at 151 Preston Road, Chorley, Lancashire PR7 5DR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/01090/FULHH, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 20-60-01; TQRQM23344134532366; and PP-12617870v1.

Preliminary Matters

2. The building has been constructed and the evidence indicates that it has been completed. The building appears to correspond to the submitted plans. Therefore, I have determined the appeal on the basis that permission is sought to retain the development that has been implemented.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. 151 Preston Road is a detached single storey dwelling set back from the road in a roughly triangular plot that tapers towards Spendmore Lane. The roadside boundary comprises a tall close-boarded fence which is recessed around an area of open hardstanding car parking to the front of the dwelling. No 151 sits at the end of a short row of non-matching 2 storey dwellings set back from the road on a common building line, most with mature roadside boundary hedgerows and vegetated frontages. Properties on the far side of the Spendmore Lane junction and on the opposite side of Preston Road are narrowly set back from the footway with open frontages. Commercial properties in the area include a car sales yard with metal fencing on the opposite side of the road. The varied styles, sizes and siting of buildings and uses results in a townscape with a mixed character and appearance.

5. The development, described as a timber summer house/ shed, is a single storey outbuilding with a shallow pitched roof. It is sited forward of the front elevation of No 151, close to the roadside edge of the plot. It measures around 4m by 7.5m and its pitched ridgeline is about 2.3m tall.
6. Long views of the outbuilding are screened from the south by the densely vegetated boundaries of neighbouring properties. Similarly, from the north, it is screened by the tall boundary treatments, including walls, fences and hedges of the Westerton Court properties to the rear. Notwithstanding its proximity to the road, the building is not prominent in passing from the adjacent footway due to its muted materials and its limited height above the tall boundary fence.
7. The outbuilding is more visible from locations on the opposite side of Preston Road. In this regard, the upper part of a gable end can be seen from in and around the bus stop and part of its long side elevation and shallow roof are and will be visible from the opposite footway, car sales yard and facing windows in properties on the far side of the road. Seen from these locations, the outbuilding is clearly forward of the building line of No 151 and neighbouring properties to the south. However, No 151 and its plot are markedly dissimilar to the neighbouring 2 storey dwellings and the outbuilding does not disrupt or detract from the relatively harmonious and verdant street scene to the south.
8. The outbuilding is viewed in juxtaposition with the strong enclosure of No 151, the appeal property itself, the hardstanding to the front of Nos 151-153, and the garden boundaries and rears of Westerton Court properties. It lies opposite commercial premises. In this unremarkable context, the low timber outbuilding does not appear out of scale or out of keeping with its immediately surrounding built environment.
9. The Council's Householder Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document Adopted January 2017 (the SPD) advises that outbuildings should be inconspicuously sited and that garages should ideally be set back from the main building line. However, the appeal site is an awkward tapering plot with a long roadside boundary and the dwelling is set back at the rear of the plot. In any case, the outbuilding is not overly prominent nor unduly visually obtrusive in the street scene. Moreover, while it may not raise the standard of design locally nor contribute positively to local distinctiveness, it is not discordant or incongruous in the mixed surrounding context.
10. In reaching my conclusion, I took account of the earlier planning permission (ref 10/00529/FUL) for a detached bungalow in the garden of No 151. Although not implemented, that scheme would have been even more prominent and sited forward of the common building line. Nevertheless, the Council found it acceptable in part as it was at the end of a row of properties on a tapering piece of land close to Spendmore Lane, and where limited views would be afforded of it due to the roadside boundary treatments of properties to the side. While that permission does not provide a justification for the appeal, nevertheless I find that the lesser visual impact of the appeal building is similarly mitigated by the tapering plot and the surrounding context.
11. Therefore, I conclude that the development does not harm the mixed character and appearance of the area. It accords with the design aims of Policy BNE1 of Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document Adopted July 2015 and the SPD. These require, among other things, that development should respect the character of

the site and the area, avoiding significant detrimental effects and that outbuildings should be commensurate in scale and function to their host.

Conditions

12. The Council suggested planning conditions in the event the appeal was allowed. I have considered these against the tests for conditions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.
13. As the development has already been completed, the standard commencement condition is not necessary. Similarly, as the dwelling is finished in brick and the outbuilding is finished in tanalised brown timber, as specified in the planning application form, a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building is not necessary or reasonable. I have however imposed a condition specifying the approved plans in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the development accords with the development plan.
15. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR