

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2024

by John Whalley

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th March 2024

Appeal ref: APP/B2355/D/23/3332186

No. 62 Burnley Road, Edenfield, Bury BL0 0HW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal of planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Anthony Parkinson against the decision of Rossendale Borough Council.
 - The application, ref. 2023/0388, dated 14 August 2023, was refused by a notice dated 4 October 2023.
 - The development is: Alteration to roof of previous extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for: Alterations to roof of previous rear extension at No. 62 Burnley Road, Edenfield, Bury BL0 0HW in accordance with application ref. 2023/0388, dated 14 August 2023, 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:

Existing Plan Drg. No. 23/745/01 dated 7 August 2023.
Proposed Plan Drg. No. 23/745/02A revision dated 22 August 2023.

Main issue

2. The decision turns on the likely effect of the proposed roof extension on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its immediate surroundings.

Appeal dwelling and proposed works

3. The appeal concerns No. 62 Burnley Road, a 2 storey mid-terrace stone built house. Whilst the house fronts onto the main Burnley Road, the rear of the terrace is serviced by a wide rough surfaced roadway that runs parallel to Burnley Road. The rear roadway also serves a mix of domestic garages, outbuildings and rear gardens to the terrace. Open grazing land extends up and beyond to the east.
4. No. 62 has a 2 storey rear extension about 2m deep to the full width of the house. This extension was built under a continuation of the rear slate roof slope. There is a small single storey porch built onto the rear extension.

5. It is proposed to build a wide pitched roof dormer in the rear extension roof slope, its deep fenestration running down into the extension's rear wall.

Considerations

6. The Council said the proposed extra roof extension would be a visually jarring, incongruous and unsympathetic addition. Although they said the additional extension to the roof of No. 62 would not reflect the character or appearance of either the host property or the surrounding built environment, it is hard to discern any uniformity or homogeneity that forms that character. The houses, their rear extensions, including roof dormers and the outbuildings on the other side of the access roadway at the rear of this Burnley Road terrace show a variability, a lack of consistency or fixed pattern, that in my view, produces an interesting and not displeasing aspect. There is not a uniformity of design and form at the rear of the terrace that suggests a severe restriction should be applied to the proposed addition to the rear of No. 62.
7. In my view, the proposed alteration and addition to the existing somewhat inelegant rear extension would not materially harm either the look of the rear of the existing house at No. 62 or the terrace of houses in which it sits. I find no significant conflict with guidance in Local Plan Policy HS9 (a) or (b) on house extensions or with NPPF intentions to achieve well-designed and beautiful places. Although the proposed pitched roof dormer to No. 62 would be large, it would remain subservient to the main extended roof of the house, thus complying with para. 8 of the Council's Rossendale Alterations & Extensions to Residential Properties SPD (2008).

Conclusion

8. I conclude that the appeal should succeed. Planning permission is granted subject to the general condition limiting the duration of the permission being applied, (s.91 of the Act), as is a condition relating to the submitted plans defining the project.

John Whalley

INSPECTOR