



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2020

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B2355/W/20/3255543

Lumb Grange, Lumb Village, Rossendale, BL0 0QR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr James Grandidge against Rossendale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0051 is dated 31 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extensions to roof structure to provide extra en-suite bedrooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and extensions to roof structure to provide extra en-suite bedrooms at Lumb Grange, Lumb Village, Rossendale, BL0 0QR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2020/0051, dated 31 January 2020, 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: Location Plan; Plans and Elevations as Proposed; LHF-02-11-20-A; LHF-02-11-20-B.
 - 3) The new roofs shall be covered with natural slates that match the size and colour of those on the existing roof, and the fronts and cheeks of the new dormers shall be finished in vertical timber boarding to match the existing dormers. These materials / finishes shall thereafter be retained.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr James Grandidge against Rossendale Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building comprises a detached dwelling that is constructed in stone and slate. It consists of 2 elements; a converted barn, and a later extension that was granted permission under application Ref 1980/154. The

development would raise the height of this extension by 600mm and would introduce new dormer windows on either side.

5. The rear elevation of the appeal building backs directly onto the street to the west. From this side, there is little to distinguish the original converted barn from the later extension, other than the modest change in ridge height and window sizes, and it appears as a single continuous structure. The rear roofslope already features a large dormer window, which is prominent in views along the street. The proposed dormer would be constructed in a similar style, albeit it would be significantly smaller in size. Whilst I note that dormers are not a common feature in the vicinity, given the existing dormer on this roofslope, I do not consider that the proposal would appear out of place.
6. The distinction between the original converted barn and the later extension is more apparent on the front elevation. In this regard, the later extension has a more agricultural appearance and is set back from the main dwelling. However, this roofslope is less prominent within the street, and views of it are partly obscured by existing buildings and vegetation. Moreover, the proposed dormer would be relatively small and would be seen in the context of the existing, much larger, dormer to the main property. In my view, it would not appear out of place in this context.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore accord with Policy 23 of the Rossendale Core Strategy (2011) and guidance contained in the Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties SPD (2008). This policy and guidance seek to ensure, amongst other things, that new development respects local context, distinctiveness, and character.

Other Matters

8. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt. However, it is agreed that the size of the proposed dormers would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. I see no reason to take a different view, and the proposal would therefore not be inappropriate development in Green Belt.
9. The appeal building is a short distance from Lumb Old Hall, which is a Grade II listed building. However, the intervening dwelling has a greater bulk and size, and the private road leading to Lumb Old Hall is flanked by a tall hedge and an outbuilding. The proposed extensions would therefore have limited intervisibility with the listed building. Moreover, they would be modest in scale and would be broadly in keeping with the design of the host property. Accordingly, the development would not harm the setting of Lumb Old Hall.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition that requires the development to accord with the approved plans. This is necessary in the interest of certainty. I have also imposed a condition relating to the proposed materials / finishes, which is necessary in order to preserve the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR