



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2025

by **N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M2372/D/25/3371392

18 Albany Road, Blackburn, Lancashire, BB2 6EQ

- 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 Naveed Aslam against the decision of Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 10/25/0309.
 - The development proposed is a retrospective application for 2nd floor level rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description provided on the application form refers to the retrospective nature of the planning application relating to this appeal. For confirmation, the development the subject of this appeal has already taken place and is referred to below as “the development.”

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Corporation Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a mid-terrace dwelling, two storeys in height and with a bay window to the ground floor. It is set back from the pavement behind a low brick wall and a small front garden area. The relatively long terrace within which it is located is of brick and slate construction, albeit the appeal property and a neighbouring dwelling have been rendered.
5. Albany Road slopes quite steeply away from Revidge Road, which is located to the north west of the appeal property, affording some impressive views across Blackburn to the hills beyond. The surrounding area is residential. To the front of the terrace within which the appeal property is located, on the opposite side of Albany Road, there are one and two storey semi-detached dwellings set behind gardens and with longer gardens to the rear; whilst behind Albany Terrace there is a ginnel separating it from the rear of a similar terrace of two storey dwellings running parallel along Edgeware Road.

6. The appeal dwelling is located within the Corporation Park Conservation Area. This includes Corporation Park, a Grade II* Listed Registered Park and Garden (the Council is satisfied that the development is visually separated from and has no impact on Corporation Park itself) and surrounding residential properties, including high-quality detached and semi-detached Victorian and Edwardian villas and rows of terraced dwellings.
7. Albany Road is reflective of the character of the area's red brick terraces developed in the later 19th and early 20th Century. Dwellings are set back behind low walls enclosing small garden frontages, with stone detailing to ground floor bay windows, decorative door surrounds and canopies. These features lend a strong sense of history and uniformity to the Corporation Park Conservation Area.
8. During my site visit, I observed that whilst there have been alterations and/or extensions to dwellings within Albany Road, dwellings within the terrace have retained many period features and the terrace as a whole has retained much of its original character.
9. The rear of dwellings along Albany Road back on to the ginnel between it and Edgware Road. During my site visit, I noted that the roofscapes of both terraces present simple slate roofs as well as a number of repeating slate-roofed outriggers, which sit comfortably below main ridges. This affords a pleasant collective character, in keeping with the Corporation Park Conservation Area's period and uniform characteristics.
10. The ginnel itself forms one of a number of linked streets and alleyways that, in providing for pedestrian routes and access, form part of the Corporation Park Conservation Area's interest.
11. The development comprises an L-shaped dormer window which extends above the main roof and the outrigger. The dormer appears as a tall, somewhat boxy and bulky feature. It projects almost the full length of the outrigger and does so at a height which extends well above the ridge height of the outrigger's roof. This results in this element of the dormer drawing attention to itself as an unduly dominant addition.
12. Further, the dormer above the outrigger appears clumsy and awkward in its surroundings. It draws attention to itself as a large and somewhat boxy feature, widely visible in views from the ginnel and surrounding dwellings. It extends well above the height of the neighbouring element of the original outrigger's ridge and in so doing, it appears as an incongruous feature. It also appears as an awkward and ill-fitting addition when seen above the outrigger's ridge height and against adjacent chimneys.
13. As a consequence of the above, I find that the dormer draws attention to itself as an incongruous feature that disrupts the uniform qualities of the area to a harmful degree. Consequently, the development detracts from and does not conserve the appearance of the Corporation Park Conservation Area.
14. Having regard to paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and to Planning Practice Guidance, I consider that the harm to the character and appearance of the Corporation Park Conservation Area is less than substantial.

15. This needs to be balanced against any public benefits the development may bring and, in this regard, there is nothing before me that comprises or amounts to a public benefit that outweighs the harm identified.
16. Taking all of this into account, I find that the development harms the character and appearance of the Corporation Park Conservation Area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and to Policies CP7, CP8, DM26 and DM27 of the Blackburn with Darwen Local Plan 2021-2037, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

17. In support of the proposal, the appellant draws attention to other dormer developments in the surrounding area. However, none of these represent development or circumstances so similar to the development before me as to provide for direct comparison. In any case, I have found that the development results in significant harm and this is not something that is reduced or mitigated by the presence of other developments elsewhere.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR