



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2022

by J D Clark BA (Hons) DpTRP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B2355/D/22/3307705

8 Grane Park, Haslingden, Rossendale BB4 5HB

- 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 Nasar Khan against the decision of Rossendale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/0363, dated 11 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is rear extension & the remodelling of the existing front and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. For certainty, the address referred to above is taken in part from the application form and the remainder from the appeal form and the decision notice.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Grane Park is a cul-de-sac comprising mainly of dormer bungalows. No 8 Grane Park is one of a pair of semi-detached bungalows and whilst it has dormer windows in its front elevation, the attached dwelling, No 6 Grane Park does not. No 8's front dormers are modest in scale and set back from the front and rear roof slopes. Both dwellings have dormer windows to the rear. Grane Park runs off the main highway known as Grane Road. As such, No 8 can be seen when entering the cul-de-sac due to its raised location close to Grane Road and on a bend in the cul-de-sac. The proposal is for a rear extension and the remodelling of the existing front and rear dormers.
5. The proposed enlarged dormers would be no closer to the ridge of the dwelling than the existing dormers and the front dormer would be set back from the front elevation. The dormers themselves would not enlarge the footprint of the dwelling. However, the front and rear dormers would be larger and bulkier than the existing dormers and their box like design would exacerbate their effect making them visually prominent in the street scene.

6. No 10 Grane Park is set back behind Nos 8 and 12 and due to the land levels is higher from the road. The rear extension would be lower than this dwelling as No 8's rear garden is terraced upwards and the extension would be at the lower level. However, the difference in land levels does not lessen the impact of the rear extension to No 8 itself in terms of it appearing as a disproportionate and bulky addition.
7. The proposed rear extension would add a large structure to the rear of No 8. Due to its flat roofed design and height of the extension in relation to the existing eaves height of the dwelling, it would appear large and disproportionate to the host dwelling which, together with the enlarged dormers, would be out of character with the surrounding properties.
8. Overall, I conclude therefore that the scale and mass of the proposed development would be out of keeping and disproportionate to the existing dwelling and at odds with the immediate surrounding area. Moreover, the elevated position of No 8, especially when entering the cul-de-sac, and the surrounding land levels would mean that, extended as proposed, the development would be highly prominent in the immediate surrounding area and harm the character and appearance of the area.
9. For the reasons stated above, as well as conflicting with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework¹, the proposal would be contrary to Local Plan policies ENV1 and HS9² and the guidance in the Council's SPD³, which require high quality development that takes account of the character and appearance of the local area and, amongst other things, requires extensions to dwellings to respect the existing dwelling and its surroundings in terms of scale, size and design and fenestration, including dormer windows.

Other Matters

10. Reference is made by the Council with regard to daylight and sunlight to the adjoining property, No 6. The appellant has submitted a sunlight and daylight analysis and an appeal decision on another property in relation to this matter⁴. However, this has not been considered by the Council as a reason for refusal and I find no harm with regard to this matter. Also, the parking arrangement is referred to by the Council in its Officer Report, but again is not a reason for refusal and I also find no harm in this regard.
11. Notwithstanding that I have found no harm with regard to these other matters raised, these carry limited weight but do not overcome the harm I have found with regard to the main issue identified above.

Conclusion

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

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

¹ Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, 2021.

² Rossendale Borough Council Rossendale Local Plan 2019 to 2036, Adopted 15 December 2021.

³ Rossendale Borough Council Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties A Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

⁴ Appeal Decision Ref: APP/B2355/D/17/3178521.