
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2017

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R2330/D/17/3169998

69 Rhyddings Street, Oswaldtwistle, BB5 3EY

- 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 Mrs J Alaeddin against the decision of Hyndburn Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 11/16/0415, dated 17 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a change of hip to gable and a rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Rhyddings Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Rhyddings Conservation Area is characterised by a mixture of late 19th and early 20th Century industrial, commercial, residential and community buildings, which have a special historical connection with Robert Watson and his family. The terraced housing is laid out in a gridiron pattern. The dwellings are constructed of a limited palette of natural materials, including local stone and blue slate. These features give the terraces a visual harmony.
 4. The terraces have both hipped and gabled main roofs. The appeal terrace has hipped roofs, as has the facing terrace. Hipped roofs are, therefore, a strong characteristic of this end of Rhyddings Street. I note the appellant's comments that the materials of the extensions would match those of the existing building. However, changing one of the hips to a gable would unbalance the appearance of the two facing terraces and detract from their simple historical form.
 5. Furthermore, the proposed dormer would be across almost the whole width of the main rear roof. It would have a flat roof which would jar with the other pitched roofs of the house; and its size and form would make for a bulky and boxy appearance. The *Hyndburn Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* advises that dormers should be kept as small as possible with a substantial area of pitched roof retained, and that dormer roofs should preferably be pitched. It would not conform to this advice.
-

6. The alterations to the roof would look incompatible with the house. The property is in a prominent position at the corner of the street and therefore the extensions would be highly visible and would detract from the otherwise attractive street-scene. I note the appellant's reference to other similar developments in the area but they do not provide justification for me to allow harmful development.
7. S72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a statutory duty upon me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. The development would be incongruous with its surroundings but, as it would affect just one house, it would cause less than substantial harm to the special interest and significance of the conservation area as a whole.
8. In these circumstances paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework says that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The extensions would provide enlarged family accommodation for the appellant but I do not consider that this constitutes a public benefit. In consequence, I do not consider that there are any public benefits of the proposal which can outweigh the harm I have found.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve, let alone enhance, the character or appearance of the Rhyddings Conservation Area. It would be contrary to Policy ENV6 of the Hyndburn Core Strategy (CS); and Policies E.10 and E.8 of the Hyndburn Borough Local Plan. In combination these policies seek to encourage high quality design and to protect character and appearance.
10. The Council has quoted CS Policy ENV 7 but this policy relates to residential amenity rather than visual amenity and I find no direct conflict with this policy.
11. I have considered all other matters raised but nothing outweighs the harm I have found and the appeal is dismissed.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR