



## Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 22 June 2021

**by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MIEnvSc**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 13 July 2021**

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/21/3274158**

### **3 Moor Field, Whalley, Clitheroe, Lancashire BB7 9SA**

- 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 M Seery against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 3/2021/0237, dated 2 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2021.
  - The development proposed is raised roof to dormer bungalow to create full two storey dwelling and alteration to parking arrangements.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Preliminary Matters**

#### **Main Issue**

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

### **Reasons**

3. No 3 is a detached single storey dormer dwelling with a flat roof single storey side garage extension. It is constructed in red brick and render with concrete roof tiles. It is in a residential area characterised by predominantly single storey dwellings, both with simple roofs and dormer extensions. Two storey dwellings are occasional. Properties are set back from the street and separated from the footway by low walls and in some cases hedgerows and shrubs. The similar sizes, styles and ages of properties results in a relatively coherent character and appearance.
4. The appeal proposal would be an upwards extension to create a 2 storey property. It would have a simple pitch roof with a ridge height of over 7m, which would be roughly 1.2m taller than the existing ridge. The roof would have a shallow pitch above the new elevations, resulting in a significantly bulkier building.
5. The proposal would not disrupt a group of matching properties. Nevertheless, by virtue of being in a long row of single storey properties, its increased size and scale would be visually obtrusive, including when looking along Moor Field in either direction. In this regard, while a relatively small increase in the height of the property might be assimilated, the addition of a full first floor beneath the roof would not. This is because, irrespective of the changes in topography, the street scene is characterised by properties with single storey elevations, predominantly steep roof pitches and repeating similar front dormer features.

The proposal would not be in keeping with the surrounding built environment. It would not make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness or contribute to a strong sense of place.

6. At the time of my visit, I saw 2 storey properties in the area. I understand they were designed and built as part of the original residential layout. They appear to have smaller footprints and narrower front elevations, and they are more widely spaced and separated from neighbouring properties, than the appeal property. In contrast, the proposal would clearly be an extended single storey property due to the retention of its original ground floor elevation and layout which would match dormer properties elsewhere in the street. Two storey properties in the area are largely in less prominent locations, they do not form a visual context for the scheme and they do not provide a justification for it.
7. Therefore, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the aims of Policies DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008-2028 Adopted December 2014. These require, among other things, that proposals should be sympathetic in terms of size, scale, massing and style, taking into account layout, visual appearance and the relationship between buildings and its surroundings.

### **Other Matters**

8. The parties engaged with one another at the pre-application stage, at which time the Council raised a number of concerns. The scheme would not result in significant overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring residential occupiers. The proposed alterations to the frontage would maintain adequate parking provision and avoid harm to highways. These are neutral matters that weigh neither for nor against the proposal.
9. The creation of additional internal and enhanced living space would be a private benefit to the appellant. However, the plans illustrate the property already provides a reasonable standard of living accommodation, including 3 bedrooms. The appellant's desire to extend the property is understandable, but there is little to demonstrate that alternative solutions have been discounted or that there is in any case any compelling justification for the proposal.
10. The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) (Amendment) (No.2) Order 2020 introduces permitted development rights to allow the construction of additional storeys on dwelling houses. The right is subject to obtaining prior approval from the local planning authority, which will consider certain matters including the design. However, the appellant has not pursued this option because the necessary roof pitch to match the existing would not produce a pleasing design. Therefore, the theoretical permitted development rights are not a valid fallback position that justify the proposal.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict.
12. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

*Sarah Manchester*      INSPECTOR