



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2025

by R Gravett BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2315/D/24/3354958

434 Rossendale Road, Burnley, Lancs BB11 5HN

- 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 Mrs Katharine Collinge against the decision of Burnley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is HOU/2024/0439.
 - The development proposed is porch and bay window to front of dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for porch and bay window to front of dwelling at 434 Rossendale Road, Burnley, Lancs BB11 5HN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HOU/2024/0439, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawings titled 'Location Plan, Site Layout' and 'Proposed Porch and Bay Window to Front of No 434 Rossendale Road, Burnley.'
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. No 434 Rossendale Road (No 434) is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling on the north side of Rossendale Road, close to its junction with Manchester Road. It forms part of a row of three pairs of semi-detached dwellings which are uniform in their overall form and design, constructed in a buff-coloured brick at ground floor with a render finish at first, but have different fenestration and porch details resulting in some variation in appearance. It is also viewed in the context of a much wider variety of dwelling types to the west featuring projecting bay windows.
4. It is proposed to replace an existing porch canopy with a gabled porch, which both parties agree, alone, could be constructed under permitted development rights afforded by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). It is only that the porch is proposed to be constructed at the same time as a proposed bay, that appears to have necessitated

its inclusion in the application. As a fall-back position available to the appellant, I attribute this some limited weight in its favour. The ground floor bay window would have a shallow pitched roof projecting to the side of the porch, together extending almost the full width of the front elevation of No 434.

5. Although the fenestration details differ, there is a degree of visual symmetry between No 434 and its semi-detached pair. I accept that the proposed development would result in some loss of this symmetry, particularly at ground floor. However, they are single-storey and the proposed additions would project only a limited amount forward of the existing dwelling and would appear contextually small.
6. The proposed bay would be less than 1m from the front elevation of its host, offset from the front building line of the proposed porch and would be slightly lower in height. Being set forward alone does not necessarily mean a development would not be subservient. In totality the additions would be modest in scale, and as a matter of judgement, would not dominate, or unduly unbalance the composition of the semi-detached pair when viewed together. Consequently, the proposals would reflect the guidance in the Council's *Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2022)* (SPD) that front extensions and porches are eye catching and therefore particular care must be taken with semi-detached properties.
7. The ground floor roofline of the proposed development would be visible from the west over the front fence of the non-attached neighbour but would be largely screened from the east by the hedges and fences along the Rossendale Road frontage. Even without this screening, because of its limited projections and single-storey height, the proposed development would not significantly alter the form or pattern of development, including the openness of the front gardens. The bay would also not be dissimilar to features on many properties just to the west. Overall, the proposed development would appear a sympathetic, proportionate addition to both its host and the surrounding area.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area. It would accord with policies SP5 and HS5 of Burnley's Local Plan (2018) (LP) which together require new development is of a high standard of design, subordinate to the host building, and respects existing, or locally characteristic layouts, scale and massing. It would also not conflict with the provisions of LP Policy SP4 insofar as development is expected to be of an appropriate type and scale.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition specifying the approved plans is necessary in the interests of certainty. A condition requiring the materials of the extension to match those of the existing dwelling is also necessary, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
10. The Council have suggested a condition is imposed requiring the existing hedge to the front of No 434 is retained and maintained at a height of not less than 2m. I have concluded that, even without screening, the proposed extension would be a sympathetic addition to its host and would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. I do not therefore find that such a condition is necessary in this case.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, the proposal accords with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations do not indicate a decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude the appeal should be allowed.

R Gravett

INSPECTOR