



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 October 2019

by R Cooper BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2315/D/19/3233713

11 Stephenson Drive, Burnley BB12 8AJ

- 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 Luke Simpson against the decision of Burnley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/2019/0143, dated 28 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey and single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling located in a residential street, which leads on to a cul-de-sac. Whilst the property has a small existing single storey side extension, this is set back from the front elevation, and the appearance of the dwelling remains balanced and symmetrical with the adjoining semi No 9. The property is located on a corner of Avondale Avenue, a road which runs along the side of the site to garages at the rear, continuing on to Ightenhill Park Mews and Ightenhill Park. The site appears prominent when traveling in both directions along this road. The main buildings at Nos 11 and 13 are set a similar distance away from this road, providing a sense of space either side of the entrance to Avondale Avenue.
4. Whilst the proposed two storey extension would be set back from the front elevation at the first floor by 1m, the ridge would continue across at the same height as the main roof of the host dwelling, and the extension would not appear subordinate. The extension would extend out to the side by 3m, leaving only 600mm between the gable and the boundary. No 9 does not have sufficient space to the side to construct a similar proportioned extension. As a result, the pair of semis would lose their existing symmetry, and it would create an imbalance in their appearance. Therefore, the extension would harm the character and appearance of the building.
5. Whilst the side of the proposed extension would be set in off the boundary, this would not be sufficient to mitigate its imposing appearance, and the two storey

side elevation would appear overbearing when viewed from Avondale Avenue. The extension would appear uncharacteristically close to the boundary, and the space on this side of the entrance to Avondale Avenue would be lost, resulting in an incongruous feature within the street scene.

6. An appeal (APP/Z2315/D/18/3214201) for a similar extension was dismissed by the previous Planning Inspector because of its scale, and the imbalance it would cause between the pair of semi-detached dwellings. I understand that this appeal proposal has been submitted to address these previous concerns. However, for the reasons given above the extension would not be subordinate and would have a significant impact on the street scene.
7. Consequently, the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would not accord with Policy HE5 of Burnley's Local Plan 2018 which requires extensions to be of high quality design, that are subordinate to the existing building, and respect the character and scale of the host building and its setting.

Other matters

8. I have considered the mix of dwelling types along Stephenson Drive, and the various other extensions within the vicinity of the site, and the examples provided including those at Nos 7 and 13. However, the presence of these do not alter my findings above. In any event, I am required to reach conclusions based on the individual circumstances of this appeal.
9. I understand that correspondence had taken place between the Council and the appellant during the consideration of a previous application (APP/2018/0315), and amendments were suggested. However, this does not alter my findings above.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

R Cooper

INSPECTOR