

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2017

**by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 22 December 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R2330/D/17/3179136**

**155 Manchester Road, Accrington, Lancashire BB5 2NY**

- 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 Martin Gaskell against the decision of Hyndburn Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 11/17/0148 was refused by notice dated 25 May 2017.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a rear dormer.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mainly 2-storey mid terrace house in a predominantly residential area. Despite some external alterations and additions, the terrace to which No 155 belongs retains a broad uniformity in its design, built form and general appearance. Consequently, this terrace makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Christ Church Conservation Area (CA) within which the site falls. To my mind, the CA derives its significance as a designated heritage asset in part from its long 2-storey terraces that largely retain their historic character and appearance.
4. The proposed dormer extension would be placed onto the rear roof slope of No 155 and clad in slate to match the host building. Although mostly set in from the main roof on all 4 sides, the appeal scheme would still be a sizeable addition, covering a major part of the roof slope. Due to its scale and elevated position, the new dormer would be a highly conspicuous feature of the finished building. It would draw the eye from the road that runs to the rear of the host terrace and also from the upper back windows of some properties along Worsley Street. In these views, the size and prominent position of the new dormer would cause it to visually dominate the rear of the dwelling and disrupt the roofscape of this part of the host terrace that, with a small number of exceptions, is free of large built additions. For these reasons, the proposal would be an unsympathetic addition.
5. By materially harming the character and appearance of the host terrace, the proposal would diminish the positive contribution that it makes to the character

and qualities of the CA. Consequently, the character of the CA would fail to be preserved, to which I attach considerable importance and weight. Although the harm to the CA would be less than substantial, I am not persuaded that the public benefits of the proposal would outweigh this harm.

6. At the site visit, I saw that development had taken in place in the CA although none that I observed was directly comparable in to the proposal before me. Reference is made to other proposals within the CA that the appellant states have been approved despite objections raised including a takeaway and a rear dormer in the same terrace as No 155. However, few details of this or any other scheme have been provided and so I am unable to conclude that their circumstances are the same or very similar to the proposal. While I acknowledge that some alterations have taken place at roof level within the same terrace as No 155, and that there is a rear dormer further along the building, these serve to illustrate that such changes can have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the building. In any event, each case should be assessed on its own merits, as I have done in this instance.
7. Design Guidance 17 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *Householder Design Guide* (SPD) states that new dormers should not dominate the roof. The SPD also advises that new dormers should be kept as small as possible with a substantial area of the pitched roof retained. The proposal would be at odds with this guidance. The National Planning Policy Framework also emphasises the importance of securing high quality design and states that development should add to the overall qualities of an area. For the reasons given, the proposal would not do so.
8. Against that background, I conclude on the main issue that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the local area. As such, it conflicts with Policies Env6 and Env7 of the Hyndburn Core Strategy (CS). These policies aim to ensure that new development maintains and enhances the character and quality of the townscape and avoids a loss of local amenity through, amongst other things, visual impact.
9. Once complete, the proposal would provide extra accommodation to meet the needs of a growing family and improve their living conditions. The appellant also states that he is neither in a position nor wants to move from a property in which he has lived for some time and has been happy. The appellant also states that all neighbours that he has spoken to are in favour of the proposal and that others have not objected. However, these considerations do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.

## **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Gary Deane*

INSPECTOR