
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 November 2014

by Nigel Harrison BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 4 November 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/D2320/D/14/2221003
26 Ollerton Street, Adlington, Chorley, PR6 9LF

- 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 Robert and Mrs Susan Perrins against the decision of Chorley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 14/00370/FUL dated 31 March 2014, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2014.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension and detached double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension and detached double garage at 26 Ollerton Street, Adlington, Chorley, PR6 9LF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 14/00370/FUL dated 31 March 2014, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1/6 Rev A: *Existing Plans*; 2/6 Rev A: *Existing Elevations*; 3/6 Rev A: *Proposed Plans*; 4/6 Rev A: *Proposed Elevations*; 5/6 Rev A: *Proposed Perspective*; and 6/6 Rev A: *Proposed Site Plan*.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension and detached outbuilding hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) The detached garage/outbuilding hereby permitted shall not be used at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the use of the dwelling known as No 26 Ollerton Street, Adlington.

Main Issue

2. I consider the one main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. This section of Ollerton Street is dominated by pairs of semi-detached dormer style dwellings of a standard design common to the area. All have small single-storey front projections. The area is suburban in character, and to my mind has no strong prevailing character or especially local distinctiveness.

4. The proposal comprises two elements; a first floor extension above the existing ground floor front projection, and a detached double garage in the front garden area at the head of the cul-de-sac. The Council appears to have no overriding objections to the proposed garage, which would be largely screened from the road by an existing hedge, and based on my own observations I find no reason to disagree. It does however object to the proposed first floor extension, saying it would be visible and prominent in the street scene, and incongruous in the context of other similar properties. The extension would occupy the same footprint as the existing front projection, and would have the same eaves level and ridge height as the main dwelling. Its materials and fenestration would match the existing.
5. Policy HS9 of the *Chorley Borough Local Plan Review 2003* (ALP) says house extensions will be permitted where they would be in keeping with the existing house and surrounding buildings in terms of scale, design and materials. Similarly, Policy BNE1 of the emerging *Chorley Local Plan 2012-2016* (ELP) says permission will be granted for extensions, provided there is no significantly detrimental impact on the surrounding area.
6. More detailed guidance is to be found in the adopted *Householder Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD). This requires extensions to be subservient to the dwelling and have a lower ridge height. It also says they should respect the scale, character and proportions of the dwelling, and the character of the area. In terms of guidance for outbuildings, the SPD says their size should be commensurate with the scale of any replaced or extended property. In most respects the proposal complies with the requirements of the SPD. The one exception is the requirement for extensions to have a lower ridge height than the main dwelling. However, guidance in the SPD should not be applied prescriptively, and I favour a pragmatic approach in this case which responds to the particular site circumstances. In my opinion the modest scale and projection of the extension are sufficient to ensure that it would read visually as being subordinate to the main dwelling.
7. In the context of the immediate surroundings I consider that the proposed extension would not undermine the architectural integrity of the host dwelling and would respect the character of the area to which it relates. Nor do I find it would be harmful in terms of its impact on the street scene. Although there are no other examples of first-floor extensions set forward of dwellings nearby, I consider this factor alone is insufficient to render the scheme unacceptable.
8. I find no conflict with paragraph 58 of *the National Planning Policy Framework*, which requires development to respond to local character and identity; or with paragraph 64 which says permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving an area's character and quality. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposal represents an acceptable design solution that would not materially harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As such, I find no conflict with saved ALP Policy HS9 and ELP Policy BNE1.
9. A neighbouring occupier is concerned that removal of the existing side garage would lead to an unacceptable loss of privacy. However, it is not proposed to remove the garage as part of the scheme, and therefore the issue is not one that I need to address in my consideration of this appeal.

10. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in the light of the advice in the *National Planning Practice Guidance*. A condition is needed to secure compliance with the submitted plans in the interests of proper planning. A condition requiring matching materials is necessary in the interests of the appearance of the area. The Council has suggested a condition to ensure that the garage shall only be used for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse, and not be used for any trade or business or occupied as a separate dwelling unit independently of the main house. However, this is unnecessarily prescriptive in my view, and only the first part of the condition is needed to enable control to be retained over future use.
11. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nigel Harrison

INSPECTOR