



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2022

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25TH July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/D/22/3297743

5 Grindleton Road, West Bradford, Clitheroe BB7 4TE

- 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 J Bolton against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/2022/0118, dated 25 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is proposed single storey rear extension and side dormer. Resubmission of application 3/2021/0965.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposals on i) the living conditions of neighbouring occupants at No.7 Grindleton Road, with particular regard light and outlook; and ii) the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. No.5 Grindleton Road (No.5) is a two-storey semi-detached house. To the rear it has an existing single storey pitched roof outrigger that extends around 4m from the main elevation across less than half its width. It is proposed to construct a single storey extension that would fill the space between this existing outrigger and the low party boundary wall with the adjoining neighbour at No.7 Grindleton Road (No.7).
4. To the rear of No.7 is an existing outrigger similar to No.5, and it has a single ground floor window on the main two-storey elevation that I observed on site is to a dining room, a habitable room. The appellant has demonstrated that the closest window of No.7 lies outside the 45 degree angle on elevation. However, in plan form, the drawing submitted by the appellant (ref. 127-04) clearly shows that the centre point of the closest dining room window of No.7 would be within the 45 degree splay from the corner of the proposed extension. There would therefore be some loss of light to the only window to the rear of the house.

5. The proposed extension would have a depth of around 4m and an overall height of around 3.56m. The siting of the extension right on the party wall with No.7 and its depth, in combination with No.7's own outrigger, means that it would result in a significant sense of enclosure from the dining room window and on the patio area closest to the house. Whilst I recognise it has been designed with a hipped lantern roof so that the roof pitches away from the party boundary and minimises its height, the extension would nonetheless appear overbearing, at very close proximity. I saw on site that the existing party boundary wall is low and I accept that a higher boundary fence could be constructed without the need for planning permission. However, even at its lowest point of 2.6m to its eaves, the roof of the proposed extension would be higher and appear more substantial a structure than a typical close boarded timber fence. I find the harm to living conditions arising from the loss of natural light would therefore be exacerbated to an unacceptable degree by the tunnelling effect caused by the extension.
6. I note that there has been no objection to the proposals from the existing neighbour at No.7. An absence of an objection does not, however, always indicate an absence of harm and I am mindful of the guidance at paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework that planning decisions should ensure that development creates places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.
7. On the first main issue, I conclude that the proposed extension would cause harm to the living conditions of the neighbours at No.7, by reason of loss of natural light and outlook. Consequently, they would conflict with Policy DMG1 and DMH5 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy 2008-2028 (2014) (CS) which together require development, including extensions to existing residential properties, to be sympathetic to existing land uses and consider the effects of development on existing amenities.

Character and appearance

8. No.5 has a hipped roof and is broadly symmetrical to its attached neighbour at No.7. It forms part of a group of similar semi-detached houses on either side of Grindleton Road that have an overall uniformity in their roofline. It is proposed to construct a dormer on the south-west roof plane of No.5 to enable a bedroom and ensuite bathroom to be accommodated in the roofspace. The dormer would extend the existing ridge of the hipped roof of the host house and would have a minimal offset from its eaves. The excessive size of the dormer means that it would fill much of the existing roof plane and consequently appear a dominant addition to the host house.
9. The spacing between the semi-detached pairs on Grindleton Road is generous and as a result the proposed dormer on the side plane of the hipped roof would be highly visible in the street scene to passers-by particularly when travelling from the south west. It would appear a discordant feature that would visually disrupt the uniformity of the rooflines of the semi-detached houses within the streetscene.
10. I recognise that No.3 Grindleton Road (No.3), No.5's non-attached neighbour, has an existing dormer window that has similar proportions to the appeal proposal. The proposed dormer would be opposite the existing at No.3, but rather than mirroring it and achieving a visual sense of balance, I find it would unbalance its attached neighbour at No.7. Further, I observed on site that the

existing dormer at No.3 is very prominent in the streetscene, visually unbalancing its own semi-detached pair, and the proposal would only exacerbate the visual discordance in the streetscene. I concur with the Council that the dormer at No.3 is an anomaly and, albeit previously found acceptable by the Council, I am not persuaded that it justifies the appeal proposal now before me.

11. I therefore find that the proposed dormer would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host house and the wider streetscene. It would conflict with CS Policies DMG1 and DMH5 in so far as they require development to be of a high standard of design which considers the building in context.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has drawn my attention to two houses opposite No.5 (No.12 and No.26 Grindleton Road) where part single, part two-storey rear extensions have been approved by the Council. I have not, however, been provided with any further details of these approvals, such that I can assess whether they are comparable to the proposal before me.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

R Jones

INSPECTOR