
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2020

by K Savage BA MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R2330/D/19/3243881

30 Hill Street, Baxenden, Accrington BB5 2RB

- 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 Lynch against the decision of Hyndburn Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 11/19/0261, dated 22 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a dormer loft extension to the front and rear of the property and erection of a porch to the front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the dormer loft extension to the front and rear of the property. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the erection of a porch to the front elevation and planning permission is granted for a porch to the front elevation at 30 Hill Street, Baxenden, Accrington BB5 2RB, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 11/19/0261, dated 22 July 2019, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and 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 front porch hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing V19-01-03 Revision A (Location/Block Plan); Drawing V19-01-01 (Existing Plans & Section); Drawing V19-01-02 (Proposed Plans and Sections).
 - 3) The external surfaces of the front porch hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on Drawing V19-01-02 (Proposed Plans and Sections).

Procedural Matters

2. I recognise that the Council's reason for refusal refers only to the front dormer; however, based on the plans the loft extension would be a single structure spanning over the ridge of the roof and so I have treated it as a single entity.
3. For the reasons that follow, I find the proposed porch to be acceptable and it is clearly severable both physically and functionally from the proposed roof extension. Therefore, I intend to issue a split decision in this case and grant planning permission for the porch.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located within a terrace of eighteen stone-built dwellings. The terrace maintains a substantial degree of consistency and rhythm to its roofline, with a single pitched roof, hipped at either end, and uniformly interspersed with chimney stacks. The only exceptions to this are two dormer extensions at Nos 6 and 10, both of which comprise a front and rear dormer within a single structure oversailing the main ridge line. A similar form of roof extension is proposed at the appeal site.
6. Whilst the two dormers have disrupted the original uniformity of the roofline, they are located towards one end of the terrace, such that there remains a substantial, uninterrupted run of dwellings with unaltered roofs between Nos 12 and 36. The consistency of the roofline is evident in views along Hill Street from its junction with Hollins Lane, and on approach along the lane to the rear of dwellings on Manchester Road. The rear roofline, widely visible from the adjacent access road and open space, is similar in form, with the very modest exception of a small projecting window within the roof of the appeal dwelling.
7. It was clear from my observations of neighbouring terraces that dormer windows are not a typical feature of the dwellings in the area, and those at Nos 6 and 10 are isolated exceptions, which I understand did not receive planning permission. The proposed roof extensions would be located toward the opposite end of the terrace to those at Nos 6 and 10, where they would stand out as isolated, conspicuous features which would severely disrupt the consistent appearance of the roofline.
8. Moreover, the dormer windows would create a visible third floor to the dwelling which would harmfully increase its scale relative to the modest, two storey terraced dwellings which characterise the street and form part of the local vernacular, in a similar manner to that which has already occurred with respect to Nos 6 and 10. The size and shape of the dormers, and their position high on the roof slopes, would further conflict with the guidance of the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (September 2009). Whilst I recognise the appellant's attempt to use more sympathetic materials than used at Nos 6 and 10, this would not be sufficient to overcome the disruptive visual impact of the proposal.
9. For these reasons, the proposed dormer roof extension would harm the character and appearance of the area, and would conflict with Policy Env6 of the Hyndburn Core Strategy (January 2012) (the CS) and Policy DM10 of the Development Management Development Plan Document (January 2018) (the DPD), which seek high quality design which takes into consideration principles of urban form and grain, scale and appearance and which maintains and enhances the character and quality of the townscape. There would also be conflict with the similar aims for high quality design set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.
10. The proposal also seeks a front porch, composed in stone, glass and timber with a dual pitched, tiled roof. The Council does not oppose this part of the

scheme, though no specific considerations of its visual impact are set out in the officer's report. Nonetheless, I saw that there were four examples of porches to the front of the terrace at Nos 10, 14, 20 and 22. The porches are thus more spread across the terrace and are not as prominent as the roofline in longer views of the terrace is given their ground level position and partial screening provided by intervening front garden hedging. I also note that a porch was granted planning permission in 2011¹, but was not constructed.

11. The proposed porch would be modest in scale and similar in design to those at Nos 10 and 14, utilising sympathetic materials which would assimilate the porch into the front elevation. As such, it would preserve the character and appearance of the area, and would not conflict with the aforementioned development plan policies.
12. In addition, the modest scale of the porch would not lead to harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants, in accordance with the requirements of Policies Env7 of the CS and DM29 of the DPD.

Conditions

13. I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, and only in relation to the part of the proposal permitted, in the interest of certainty. A further condition is needed to require adherence to the proposed porch materials to preserve the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the front porch and dismissed insofar as it relates to the roof alterations.

K. Savage

INSPECTOR

¹ Council Ref: 11/07/0497