



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2021

by R Morgan BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2315/D/21/3278952

Kenmuir, Burnley Road, Briercliffe, BURNLEY, BB10 2JJ

- 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 Mohammed Ali against the decision of Burnley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref HOU/2021/0006, dated 5 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is three storey side extension, rear dormer and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the Council made its decision, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been issued. I am satisfied that the changes to national policy do not materially affect the issues raised or prejudice the cases made by either party.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property fronts onto Burnley Road in a primarily residential area. Properties in the vicinity vary in age, type and design, with semi-detached and terraced houses being the predominant development form. Kenmuir is the end property in a row of three pairs of semi-detached houses which are similar in design and step down as the road drops towards the centre of Briercliffe.
5. When viewed from the street, the appeal property is modest in appearance, with a hipped roof and short ridgeline. Although it appears to be a two storey house from the street, the drop in levels across the site means that there are three storeys at the rear, and the building is long and narrow in appearance when viewed from the adjacent footpath.
6. The proposed two and three storey side extension would be of considerable width compared to the original house, and would appear out of proportion with its host. The proposed additional area of roof with an elongated ridge, slightly below the highest point of the roof, would further contribute to the overall bulk of the proposal. Although there would be a modest set back from the front

elevation, the extension would not appear subservient to the host dwelling, and the creation of the new, long ridgeline would fail to respect the character of the original building, unbalancing the pair of houses.

7. The proposed entrance at the side would reflect the original form of the building, but the porch would be sited close to the front building line, and would be clearly visible from the street and footpath, despite its lightweight appearance. As a result, it would further contribute to the excessive width of the proposed development, which would appear disproportionately large in relation to the host dwelling.
8. The appeal property is adjacent to an area of open space, and is a considerable distance from the next house along Burnley Road, so the proposed extension would not erode a small gap between built form. However, the site is on a slope and it would be necessary to raise the ground level to accommodate the proposed development. The scale and bulk of the extension, combined with its raised level, would increase the prominence of the proposal within the streetscene to a harmful extent.
9. The side and rear elevations of Kenmuir are visible from the footpath which passes alongside the appeal site. When viewed from the field at the back of the house, the rear elevation is partly screened by a garden tree and wooden fence, but the proposed extension, including the altered roof with box dormer, would be clearly visible. The box dormer would be positioned within the extended roofscape and would not appear particularly dominant when viewed from the rear. However, the overly elongated ridgeline would fail to reflect the form of the existing pair of semis, and this would be clearly apparent from the rear as well as from the street.
10. The extension would be formed of materials to match the existing dwelling, and would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers. Sufficient outdoor amenity space would be retained, and the submitted drawings show space for off street parking. However, these factors represent a lack of harm, which would not outweigh the detrimental impact that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.
11. I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy SP5 of Burnley's Local Plan 2018, which requires that development respects existing scale and massing. There is also conflict with Policy HS5 of the same plan, regarding the need for extensions to be subordinate to the existing building and to respect the architectural characteristics and scale of the host dwelling.

Conclusion

12. The proposal fails to comply with the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR