

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2021

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M2372/D/21/3278725

1 Belper Street, Blackburn BB1 5HA

- 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 & Mrs Sajid & Jamilabanu Patel against the decision of Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 10/21/0529, dated 20 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey and front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits.

Reason

3. The appeal relates to a dwelling which sits on a corner plot at the end of Belper Street with its side elevation facing Peter Street. The dwellings either side of the junction with Peter Street are set back a comfortable distance from the back edge of the pavement at first floor level and this arrangement makes a noticeable and positive contribution to a spacious street scene.
 4. The proposal includes a two storey side extension along with a single storey element which would span the full width of the existing dwelling and the two storey extension. The proposed two storey side extension would be set below the ridge of the host dwelling, it would be set back from the front elevation at first floor level and it would be finished in matching external materials. However, it would be a substantial addition, occupying all of the space between the side elevation of the host dwelling and the boundary with the pavement.
 5. The two storey element of the dwelling would be brought much closer to the back edge of the pavement, breaching the established and broadly consistent building line along Peter Street. This would be in direct conflict with policy RES E18 of the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document titled
-

'*Residential Design Guide*' (SPD) which requires extensions on corner plots to respect the building lines of both streets.

6. The effect would see the dwelling appear unduly prominent within the street scene and it would unacceptably reduce the feeling of spaciousness at the junction. In addition, I am mindful that the appeal dwelling has been the subject of single storey extensions which occupy a substantial proportion of the space to the rear of the dwelling, leaving only a limited useable private amenity area. The proposed two storey extension would reduce this space further and I share the Council's view that when seen alongside the earlier additions, it would amount to an over-development of the curtilage of the property.
7. In light of the above factors, I find that the proposed two storey element of the extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits. In such terms, the proposal conflicts with policies 8 and 11 of the Council's adopted Local Plan Part 2 and policies RES E5, RES E9 and RES E18 of the SPD which collectively promote a good standard of design which reinforces the established character of the locality.

Other considerations

8. The Appellants explain that the current dwelling is too small for their growing family and extending is more affordable than moving house. Whilst I sympathise with this situation, it is an issue faced by many families and it does not, in itself, justify a visually harmful form of development in this instance.
9. The Appellants assert that the proposed extension would not harm the living conditions of nearby residents and there would be no change to parking arrangements. This is not disputed, but these are neutral factors in the overall planning balance.
10. Finally, the Appellants refer generally to a range of extensions present within the local area. Whilst I do not know the precise planning circumstances behind any of these additions, none that I saw were directly comparable in terms of their size and siting to the proposal before me. In any event, I have determined the appeal scheme on its individual merits, taking into account the specific context within which it would sit.

Overall Conclusion

11. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits, contrary to the development plan policies and design guidance outlined above. The arguments advanced by the Appellants do not outweigh this harm and policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR