
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R2330/D/25/3372968

100A New Lane, Oswaldtwistle, Lancashire BB5 3QW

- 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. Kieran Georgy against the decision of Hyndburn Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 11/25/0181.
 - The development proposed is for a new front dormer extension to create a new bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure and Main Issue

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal scheme, the main issue in regard to which is its effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

3. The appeal building is one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings converted from a former school building. Its original use gives the property a unique architectural character which, despite its subdivision, retains its legibility as one. This includes a distinctive single storey front projection with a mono-pitched roof that transitions into hipped sides. It is in an area formed of rows of terraced houses, with some detached and semi-detached properties. They are unified by a cohesive, traditional architecture and material palette. This results in a consistency and originality which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The front dormer would be confined within the front projection's roof slope and existing footprint, being finished in matching slate tiles. However, its ridge would rise above the existing mono-pitch roof. This, combined with the forward projection, would result in substantial bulk to the slope. This would cause the central portion of the front elevation to appear disproportionately pronounced and unacceptably unbalanced, reducing the quality of the original building's legibility. The inclusion of a large apex window would further accentuate its presence, introducing a modern feature that would contrast unacceptably with the building and surrounding area's traditional character. As such, the combination of the proposal's scale, massing and design would create a dominant and discordant addition, where its prominence would be emphasised by its low siting within street-level sightlines.
5. Whilst the existing single storey front projection is already a notable feature, its subordinate form, traditional design and use of matching materials allow it to

integrate sympathetically into the street scene. In contrast, the proposal would introduce an incongruous feature, which would appear obtrusive against the simplicity of the existing roof form. The appeal building is also viewed in context with the adjacent rows of terraced houses that frame its setting. The existing front projection extends well beyond their building lines and already appears as an obvious structure. Adding a front dormer on top of it would exaggerate its presence, resulting in a conspicuous and jarring addition to the street scene.

6. The proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policy DM26 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2018 and Policy Env6 of The Core Strategy 2012. Together, and amongst other things, these policies require new developments to deliver high quality design by taking into consideration urban structure, height and massing, façade and interface, details and materials, and streetscape and landscape.

Other Matters

7. I have not been provided with full details of other planning approvals cited. As such, I cannot be sure that they represent a sufficient comparison to the appeal scheme such that I would change my findings. Additionally, none of the other examples strike me as being adequately comparable to the point I would find the appeal scheme acceptable. They either relate to original features, a two storey projection, a place of worship or front dormers within main roofs set within a different context. I am also uncertain whether the cited front dormers have planning approval.
8. The Council's lack of suggestion or discussion of potential amendments are matters that should be taken up with them directly and are not for me to resolve here. The appeal scheme having less of an impact than what is allowed under permitted development rights is unproven in this instance, and I cannot be sure that a scheme for a potential side dormer would constitute development permitted without the need for express planning permission.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Kim Vo

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR