



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M2372/D/24/3356960

204 Preston New Road, Blackburn BB2 6PN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mohammed Ghafoor against the decision of Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 10/24/0632.
 - The development proposed is a retention of a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the submission of the appeal the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework). However, in relation to this appeal the aims of both sets of policies are similar. No party would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal in light of this change in policy.
3. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the development was in situ. The application has been submitted retrospectively; I have dealt with the appeal on this basis

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing property and the conservation area in general.

Reasons

5. The site is within the Revidge Conservation Area. In accordance with the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; I am required to have special regard to the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the area.
6. The site is a semi-detached Victorian brick-built property within a predominantly residential area on a busy road adjacent a petrol station. Properties in the area vary in terms of design. I note that properties in the area have in general retained their architectural form and appearance, which according to the Council form an integral part of the areas cohesive character and provide a positive contribution to the conservation area. I agree and consider that the architectural form and appearance adds to the significance of the conservation area.

7. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposal on such an asset. This is irrespective of the level of harm.
8. The development incorporates contemporary zinc cladding, this material is not noticeable on residential properties in the immediate area, however the petrol station adjacent has a typical metal canopy. Notwithstanding this visual continuity is important and materials play a significant role in achieving this.
9. In this instance the development does not complement the existing architecture of the property. The utilitarian design along with the contemporary metal cladding material are incongruous to the existing property and area in general.
10. I observed during my site visit that rear box dormer additions were present within the immediate area. However, none were comparable to the proposal before me in terms of design, materials and style of host property. Notwithstanding this each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.
11. The addition of the dormer whilst limited in terms of views creates less than substantial harm to the conservation area. Paragraph 207 of the Framework states that where a development leads to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. I find that there are no public benefits which would outweigh the harm caused by the proposed development.
12. I conclude that the development harms the character and appearance of the existing property and the conservation area in general.
13. There is conflict with Policies CP7, CP8, DM02, DM26 and DM27 of the Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council Local Plan 2021-2037, which seek amongst other things for developments to be of high design quality which preserves or enhances the historic environment. Similarly, there is conflict with Policy RES E13 of the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2015) which highlights that the form of dormers should be appropriate to the host building and character of the surrounding area.
14. There is conflict with the Framework which seeks amongst other things to ensure good design of developments and protects the historic environment.

Other Matters

15. The appellant has highlighted that the proposed development is required due to the personal circumstances, the aspiration to live as a larger family in an area where there is a shortage of larger family homes. I have had regard to the comments raised. I have not been provided with substantive evidence to demonstrate that the proposed development would be the only way to fulfil the needs of the appellant or
16. that there is a lack of larger family homes, I therefore give this limited weight.

Conclusion

17. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR