

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2017

by Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M2372/D/16/3164645

201 St James's Road, Blackburn BB1 8HQ

- 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 Arif Bajibhai against the decision of Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 10/16/0818, dated 22 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is side and rear extension. Interior remodelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council raises no objection to the side extension of the proposed development, nor to the principle of a rear extension. Therefore, I focus exclusively on the design of the rear of the proposed development, to which it objects. Due to the topography of the area and the boundary treatment the rear of the property is not very visible in the wider area. Consequently, the main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host building.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house which sits on a corner plot on the steeply sloping St James's Road. As part of my site visit, I observed that there is a mix of house types within the wider area, including a number which have been significantly extended. This finding is consistent with the photographs supplied by the appellant. However, I must determine the appeal on the basis of the particular circumstances of the case before me, and note that an objective of Policy 11 of the Blackburn with Darwen, Part 2, Site Allocation and Development Management Policies (DMP), is that all development, irrespective of its location, be of a high standard.
 4. The proposed rear extension would be approximately 6.2 m wide, which would be wider than the remaining unaltered rear elevation of the house. Consequently, due to the scale of the proposed development, the extension would appear disproportionate and would not appear subordinate to the original property.
-

5. I understand that the proposed double pitch roof has been designed to ensure that the ridge line of the roof over the rear elevation would not be higher than that of the main roof. Nonetheless, whilst this would avoid one unsatisfactory design, the small hipped roofs of two different sizes, would appear, awkward, visually busy, and unattractive. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to Policy 11 of the DMP, which of the policies brought to my attention, I consider the most relevant to my determination of the appeal before me, as it requires developments to respect the scale and massing of buildings, and to be of a high quality architectural style as a result of the use of appropriate proportions and detailing. The appeal proposal would also run counter to the guidance contained within Policy RES E7 of the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document which was adopted in 2012. This gives detailed guidance that rear extensions should be subordinate to the original house, and for the roof form and pitch to be in keeping with the existing property.
6. I understand that the appellant wishes to invest in, and extend his property, to provide more space to enable him to care for his immediate and wider family and to be able to provide a more comfortable stay for overnight guests. I also observed that the roof treatment would not be particularly visible from the side, and that even with the extension as proposed, sufficient garden area would remain. Nonetheless, the significant adverse impact of the scale of the development and roof treatment on the appearance of the rear of the host property would be unacceptable. This would be contrary to Policy 11 of the DMP, and Policy RES E7 of the RDG.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons above the appeal should be dismissed.

L. Nurser

INSPECTOR