



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 7 December 2020

by Mr Andrew McGlone BSc(Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B2355/D/20/3263303

26 Poplar Street, Haslingden, Lancashire BB4 5LY

- 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 Samina Mehmood against the decision of Rossendale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0408, dated 2 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is construction of dormer on the front elevation roof pitch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey mid-terraced dwelling constructed from stone and slate in a predominantly residential area. The surrounding area is characterised by rows of similar traditional terraced properties.
4. Having regard to the Council's Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties A Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), the proposed dormer window would not be: set back by a minimum of 1 metre behind the original wall; 0.5 metre or more below the original ridge line; and at least 0.5 metre from the party wall with 24 Poplar Street. As a result, the proposal would be a large and bulky addition to the dwelling's front roof plane. The use of matching materials would not mitigate this harm, and the proposal's incompatibility would be added to by the lack of vertical alignment between the window in the proposed dormer and those in the front elevation of the dwelling. Overall, the proposal would not be of a high standard of design that respects and responds to local context, distinctiveness and character.
5. While the dormer windows at 12 and 37 Poplar Street may have been erected without the benefit of planning permission, they are, in any event, set back from the original wall and ridge line, which means that the proposal is not directly comparable to either example and would have a more harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.
6. I recognise that the proposal may well help address the appellant's needs, and no harm would arise in respect of the highway or residents living conditions. However, these matters do not alter or outweigh the harm identified.

7. I conclude that the proposed dormer window would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and conflict would arise with Policies 23 and 24 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the SPD; which jointly seek, among other things, dormer windows to be of a high standard of design that respects and responds to local context, distinctiveness and preserve the character of the street so that developments positively contribute to the townscape.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR