
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2015

by Andrew Hammond MSc MA CEng MIET MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 January 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/D2320/D/14/2229135

17 Millfield Road, Chorley, Lancashire, PR7 1RF

- 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 Tom Bennett against the decision of Chorley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 14/00715/FUL was refused by notice dated 25 September 2014.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side/rear extension over existing garage/workshop to a detached dwelling – resubmission of application Ref 14/00445/FUL.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building and on the streetscene of Millfield Road

Reasons

3. Millfield Road contains a wide variety of semi-detached and detached properties on modest plots with a generally uniform building line. Where space permits most of the properties have garages or single storey extensions to the side and a considerable number have two-storey side extensions, generally set back at first floor level.
4. Number 19 is a semi-detached house that has, at some point in the past, been extended to the side with a set back first floor above a garage, topped by a gable end roof. No 17 also has a gable end roof and both properties are constructed close up to the shared boundary.
5. The proposed development would see No 17 extended above its existing garage almost up to the boundary with No 15 and with a gable end roof above the first floor. The first floor would be set back by 0.5m and the roof would be set down slightly from that of the original dwelling.
6. As a result the dwelling would extend across the majority of the plot to a full two storeys surmounted by a gable ended roof, with the first floor extension set back by only a minimal amount.

7. Whilst it is appreciated that the neighbouring property, No 15, has not been extended above its associated garage, similarly built up to the boundary, the form and bulk of the consequentially extended No 17 would result in a harmful terracing effect to the detriment of the character and appearance of the existing building and of the streetscene, an effect which would be aggravated were No 15 to be extended to the side, even were it to be set back.
8. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the guidance in the Council's adopted supplementary Planning Document *Household Design Guidance* which states that where a gap of at least 1m between properties cannot be achieved, a substantial set back of a minimum of 2m should be provided.
9. The proposed development would also be contrary to Policy HS9 of the Adopted Chorley Local Plan Review and Policy HS5 of the emerging Chorley Local Plan, which both require extensions to be in keeping with the existing house and surrounding buildings.
10. It is noted that there are properties in Millfield Road which have been extended with a first floor set back of less than 2m. However these either pre-date the adoption of the Supplementary Planning Guidance or have a more substantial gap to the side, unlike the appeal property.
11. For the above reasons, and taking account of all material planning considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Hammond

INSPECTOR