



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/Z2315/D/25/3372161

4 Carter Avenue, Hapton, Lancashire, BB11 5RG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Miss Caitlin Johnson against the decision of Burnley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is VAR/2025/0447.
 - The application sought planning permission for a single storey extension without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref HOU/2023/0685, dated 11 January 2024.
 - The condition in dispute is No 3 which states that: The external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.
 - The reason given for the condition is: To ensure a higher standard of finish in accordance with Policies SP5 and HS5 of Burnley's Local Plan: July 2018 (adopted 31 July 2018).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The proposal the subject of this appeal seeks the variation of Condition 3. This requires the external surfaces of a permitted single storey front extension to match those of the existing dwelling. The appellant seeks a variation of the Condition in order to allow the front extension to be clad in red cedar, a non-matching material.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey mid-terrace dwelling located in a residential area which is characterised by the presence of two storey detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings.
5. The appeal dwelling is set back from the road behind a front garden and driveway and has a garden to the rear. It has a modern appearance, with rendering, windows and roofing materials which all appear recent.
6. Carter Avenue is characterised by the predominance of dwellings of similar appearance. Dwellings are two stories in height and set back from the street along

a similar build-line. Front elevations tend to be rendered or pebble-dashed and there are similarities in dwelling design, fenestration and roofs.

7. Whilst there are some variations resulting from alterations and/or extensions, these tend to appear in keeping with host dwellings and the surrounding character of the area. Consequently, Carter Avenue presents a strong and attractive sense of uniformity.
8. In addition to the above, I note that the setting back of dwellings, the presence of front gardens, a general absence of tall front boundary features and distant views to surrounding hills combine to provide for a spacious character.
9. The appeal property benefits from permission for a small single storey extension to the front elevation. The siting of the extension is such that the proposed development would be widely visible in public views along Carter Avenue.
10. During my site visit, I observed that the predominant use of pebble-dashing and render to front elevations makes a significant contribution to the uniform character of the area. I also noted a general absence of other materials to the front elevations of dwellings along the road.
11. Given this, I find that the proposed materials would appear in such stark contrast to those of the host property and of neighbouring dwellings so as to result in the proposed development drawing attention to itself as an incongruous feature, out of keeping with its surroundings. Whilst I note that red cedar can be a high-quality material in its own right, in this case I find that it would result in the front extension appearing as an intrusive feature that would be unsympathetic to its surroundings.
12. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Burnley Local Plan (2018) Policies SP5 and HS5; and to the Council's Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2018), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

13. In support of her case, the appellant refers to the presence of red cedar at Number 1a Carter Avenue. I observed this property during the course of my site visit and noted that it comprises a relatively new dwelling, constructed at a different time to and of a notably different design to, other dwellings along Carter Avenue. Also, No 1a's front door does not face towards Carter Avenue and this, the above and the siting of the property result in it failing to share many of the uniform qualities of the area identified above.
14. Notwithstanding this, the areas of cladding referred to by the appellant appear high up on No 1a's roof and form the cladding to dormer windows. They do not appear as prominent features to that dwelling's elevation facing Carter Avenue and taking this and the above into account, they do not provide a precedent for the proposal the subject of this appeal.
15. In any case, I have found that the proposed development would result in harm, and this harm is not something that is lessened to any significant degree by the presence of another development elsewhere.

Conclusion

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

N McGurk

INSPECTOR