



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2020

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N2345/D/19/3241001

58 Regent Drive, Preston PR2 3JB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Munshi against the decision of Preston City Council.
 - The application Ref 06/2019/0746, dated 19 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension, loft conversion with rear dormer and ground floor bay window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No 58 is a 2 storey semi-detached property on a corner plot at the junction of Regent Drive and Westgate. It has been extended to the side, with a part 2 storey and part single storey extension that is subservient to the front elevation and hipped roof of its host. It forms part of a coherent group of similar properties and there is a consistency and harmony to the street scene.
4. The hipped roof of No 58 would be replaced with a gable end. The roof of the enlarged side extension would be raised, finishing below the gable ridgeline and with a hipped roof. There would be a single storey bay window to the front elevation of the extension and a dormer extension to the main rear roof slope.
5. By virtue of its set back from the front elevation of No 58, the first floor extension would be subservient to its host. However, the gable end extension to the main roof would be a bulky feature that would obliterate the original hipped roof form. Consequently, it would not be sensitive or sympathetic to the host dwelling. It would unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties and it would not relate well to the group of which it forms part.
6. The dormer would occupy the majority of the extended gable end roof slope. It would be nearly as wide as the rear elevation of the host property. Therefore, irrespective that it would be set in from the edges of the roof, it would be a disproportionately large feature. It would overwhelm the roof of No 58 and it would not respect the characteristic roofscape of the area.

7. Furthermore, there would be cumulative visual impacts in this location as a result of the increased height and bulk of the extension roof, the gable end extension and the overly large dormer. By virtue of its prominent corner location, the proposal would be visually obtrusive. It would be a dominant and incongruous feature that would disrupt the consistency of the street scene.
8. The visible roof alterations to properties on the opposite side of Regent Drive appear to be relatively unobtrusive and modest extensions to the original hipped roofs. Although large, the 2 storey side extensions to properties on nearby corner plots, including 43 Southgate to the rear of the appeal property, nevertheless respect the characteristic hipped roof form of the townscape. Schemes elsewhere are not therefore directly comparable to the appeal scheme and they do not provide a justification for it.
9. Therefore, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would conflict with saved policies D13 and H8 of the Preston Local Plan 1996-2006 Adopted April 2004 and Policy AD1(a) of the Preston Local Plan 2012-26 (Site Allocations and Development Management Policies) Adopted July 2015. These require, among other things, that extensions reflect the style of the original building and that scale and design is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. It would also fail to accord with the guidance in the Residential Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document Adopted April 2013 relating to side and dormer extensions and corner properties.

Other Matters

10. Amendments were made to the scheme to address the concerns of the Council, including in terms of the height of the extension and its set back from the front elevation. Nevertheless, the alterations and enlargement of the roof, including the gable end and the rear dormer, would be visually detrimental.
11. The proposal would not impact on the living conditions of nearby residential occupiers or the highway network. These are requirements of the development plan and they do not weigh in favour of the scheme.
12. The enhanced internal living accommodation would be a benefit to the appellant. However, the plans indicate that No 58 is currently suitable to be occupied by a large family and I am not persuaded that the proposal would make any significantly greater contribution to the local housing stock. In any case, it has not been demonstrated that there are no alternative schemes that could deliver similar benefits without the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

13. I have found that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. For this reason, the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR