



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2020

by M Madge Dip TP, MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M2372/D/20/3245019

2 Hareden Brook Close, Blackburn, Lancashire BB2 3HX

- 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 F K Hussain against the decision of Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 10/19/0960, dated 3 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension at 2 Hareden Brook Close, Blackburn, Lancashire BB2 3HX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 10/19/0960, dated 3 October 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: drg.ref 289/19 sheet 1 and drg.ref 289/19 sheet 2.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

1. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

2. Development along Bennington Street includes terraced properties located at the back edge of the footway, the estate development within which the site is located and modern estate style developments. The various housing developments adjacent to Bennington Street provide no consistent building line, with frontages and side elevations being set back varying distances from the road. Development to the north of the site backs on to Bennington Street and sits at an angle to it.

3. The site sits within a housing estate characterised by terraced blocks of varying lengths, set approximately perpendicular to one another. Adjacent blocks overlap one another resulting in a staggered layout. I saw during my visit that dwellings within the estate have been subjected to little change by way of extension or other material alterations. The original design and appearance of the estate is largely retained.
4. The Appeal site is an end terrace house fronting on to Hareden Brook Close. Its substantial side garden is set back a considerable distance from Bennington Street. The proposed extension would be of a design, scale and appearance very similar to the proportions and appearance of the existing dwelling.
5. Policy 11 of the Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) seeks to promote good design, which should enhance and reinforce the established character of the locality in terms of proportion, visual order and materials. Policies RES E9 and RES E18 of the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (RDG) require side extensions to respect the front and side building lines, integrate with the host dwelling and not be obtrusive.
6. The RDG advises that a side extension should be set down and back from the original roofline and front elevation of the host dwelling. Such an approach is intended to result in the extension being an obvious addition. However, in this instance, maintaining the building's depth, eaves and ridge heights in the proposed extension would provide a more uniform and integrated appearance to the development, generally in keeping with the host dwelling and nearby buildings. This integrated approach would be further achieved through the fenestration details and materials proposed.
7. The development would respect the building line along Hareden Brook Close. Even with the extension, No 2 would remain set back a considerable distance from Bennington Street. Given the staggered approach to the estate as a whole and the lack of consistent building line along Bennington Street, in this instance, the development would not appear incongruous, or unduly obtrusive for its corner location.
8. Having had regard to the guidance set out in the RDG and for the reasons set out above, the development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with Policy 11 of the LPP2 or RES E9 and RES E18 of the RDG.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit, a condition specifying the approved plans is necessary as it provides certainty. I have imposed a condition specifying materials as this is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above the appeal is allowed.

M Madge

INSPECTOR