



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2025

by **R Gravett BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/24/3354944

26 Whalley Road, Langho, Lancashire BB6 8EJ

- 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 Ms Ciara Beckett against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 3/2024/0614.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Retention of existing single storey side extension, with associated alterations including the provision of a pitched roof.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The planning application form states that work has already been started without permission and I observed that a single storey flat roofed extension is in situ to the side of 26 Whalley Road. However, alterations are proposed to this extension including the addition of a pitched roof. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on this basis and on the plans before me.
3. The Council's Reason for Refusal refers to the proposed development failing to satisfy '*paragraph 135©,*' but it is clear from the evidence of both main parties that this is understood to be paragraph 135 (c) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The revised version of the Framework published in December 2024 did not alter the wording of this paragraph.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host bungalow and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. No 26 Whalley Road (No 26) is a modest semi-detached dormer bungalow located on the corner of Whalley Road and Springdale Road. Whalley Road (on its south-east side) and Springdale Road are characterised by similar bungalows and whilst there is some variation in fenestration detailing and finish, there is an overall cohesion to the modest scale and form of development.
6. A single storey flat roof extension has been built to the side of No 26 replacing a small flat roofed detached garage. The new structure projects close to the Springdale Road boundary and extends the full depth of the existing bungalow, aligning with the main gable span. There is a reasonably high boundary fence along the Springdale Road frontage of No 26 and the side extension is visible and

prominent above this, with the fascia boards of the flat roof sitting above the eaves of the original gabled roof. It is proposed to replace this flat roof with a gable to match the roof form of the host bungalow. The new gable would extend the current roof form sideways with matching pitch, eaves and ridge heights. However, it would leave a small section of flat roof adjacent to an existing rear projection.

7. By extending the full depth of the existing bungalow, and continuing the ridgeline of the original roof, the side extension would result in a significant increase in the bulk and massing of No 26 on the Springdale Road frontage. Because of its corner location it would not lead to a terracing effect, but it would nonetheless appear an overly dominant addition to the host bungalow particularly from Springdale Road travelling toward Whalley Road. From here it would be viewed alongside the smaller, lower bungalow on the opposite corner. Further, because of its depth close to the Springdale Road boundary, the massing of the extension would be unduly prominent on the corner travelling south-west on Whalley Road. It would appear a discordant addition, out of character with the modest scale of development in the surrounding area.
8. The width of the side extension itself is proportionate in scale to the host bungalow, and the existing stringcourse detail in the render and box bay window offer some limited articulation to the front elevation. However, because the side extension is flush with the front elevation and the proposed gabled roof would continue the eaves and ridgeline of its host, the development would result in an expansive front elevation, which would fail to appear subservient to its host. The fenestration colour and render finish of No 26 differs from its attached neighbour, but there is nonetheless a pleasing uniformity and symmetry to the pair which would also be unbalanced by the massing of the proposed extension.
9. In 2012, the Council granted planning permission for dormer windows and a side extension to No 26, following demolition of the existing garage (Ref. 3/2012/0034) ('the 2012 permission'). The dormer windows to the front elevation have been constructed and there is no dispute between the parties that the 2012 permission remains extant. I am satisfied that there is a real prospect that this side extension would be built should this appeal fail, and there is therefore a fallback position.
10. The appellant has provided in evidence extracts of the approved drawings for the 2012 permission. These show that the side extension would be slightly wider on the front elevation of No 26 than the current appeal proposal but would taper as it projects to the rear and would similarly align with the rear elevation of the bungalow. However, the substantive difference between the two is that the side extension of the 2012 permission is offset around 900mm from the front elevation of the bungalow and, although it continues the eaves height of the host gable roof, the ridgeline has been set down.
11. Whilst the 2012 permission may have a slightly larger footprint, the generous degree of set-back from the front elevation, and the lowered ridgeline, minimises the bulk and massing of the extension. It would not appear a particularly prominent, or disproportionate addition to its host. Therefore, I find that the fallback position would be less harmful than the appeal proposal before me, and consequently it is a matter to which I afford limited weight.
12. Side extensions in the surrounding area are relatively common and differ in form, scale and overall appearance. I observed that they are also of varying success in

terms of their effect on their host, including those extensions highlighted by the appellant. The most comparable example is 46 Whalley Road (No 46), which is a similar style of semi-detached bungalow to No 26 and is located on a corner plot. No 46 has a garage extension to the side which has a minimal set back, behind a quoin corner, but in contrast to the appeal proposal, the ridgeline of the gabled roof has also been set well below the original. Consequently, it appears a proportionate and clearly subordinate addition to its host. I therefore find the examples provided by the appellant lend very little support to the appeal proposal before me.

13. I conclude on the main issue that the proposed single storey side extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host bungalow and surrounding area. It would conflict with Policy DMG1 of the Ribble Valley Borough Council Core Strategy 2008-2028: A Local Plan for Ribble Valley (2014) which requires development to be of a high standard of building design, sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, scale, massing and style. This policy is consistent with paragraph 135 (c) of the Framework.

Conclusion

14. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

R Gravett

INSPECTOR