



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 26 August 2021

by Mark Caine BSc (Hons) MTPL MRTPI LSRA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N2345/D/21/3276008

3 Forest Way, Preston PR2 8PR

- 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 Mirza Afzal Beg against the decision of Preston City Council.
 - The application Ref 06/2020/1430, dated 20 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor extension to the front, single storey extensions to rear, and porch extension to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the first floor front extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey extension to the rear and the porch extension to the front and planning permission is granted for the single storey extension to the rear and the porch extension to the front at 3 Forest Way, Preston PR2 8PR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 06/2020/1430, dated 20 December 2020, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted, insofar as it relates to the single storey extension to the rear and porch extension to the front only, shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan – drawing no 653-DWG-01, Existing site plan – drawing no 653-DWG-02, Proposed site plan – drawing no 653-DWG-03, Existing floor plans – drawing no 653-DWG-04, Existing elevations – drawing no 653-DWG-05, Proposed floor plans – drawing no 653-DWG-06, Proposed elevations – drawing no 653-DWG-07.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the single storey rear extension and front porch extension hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials specified on the planning application form and submitted drawings.

Preliminary Matters

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. The content of the revised Framework has been considered but in light of the facts in this case it does not alter my conclusion.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a two storey detached dwelling that has an attached projecting single storey front garage. Whilst there is a variety of dwelling types in the area, the immediate surroundings are characterised by similar properties that are set out in a slightly staggered arrangement within an attractive open plan layout.
5. The proposal would involve a first floor extension over the existing garage and would be constructed in materials to match those found on the main dwelling. Despite the presence of some modified hipped roofs on the single storey garages of neighbouring properties, the mass and bulk of the proposed first floor front extension would be an obvious element that would stand out above these and forward of the principal elevations of the main dwelling and the adjacent neighbouring properties.
6. This element of the proposal would thereby create a prominent feature to the front elevation of the host building that would have an overly dominant impact on the property itself and would appear visually jarring along this part of Forest Way. As a result, it would introduce an oversized, incongruous and unduly dominant feature that would be plainly visible in the street scene and from a number of neighbouring dwellings.
7. I therefore find that the proposed first floor front extension would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. As such this element of the proposal would conflict with Saved Policies D13 and H8 of the Preston Local Plan 1996-2006 (2004) and Policy AD1 of the Preston Local Plan 2012-26 (Site Allocations and Development Management Policies) (2015). Together these seek, amongst other things, to ensure that the design and scale of all new development proposals, including extensions to existing buildings are sensitive to, and in keeping with the character and appearance of the house and area.
8. It would also not accord with advice within the Council's Residential Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and the design objectives of the Framework. The proposed first floor front extension would thereby not constitute sustainable development for which there is a presumption in favour.

Other Matters

9. In reaching my findings I have had regard to other remodelling projects in the area that the appellant has referenced and the first floor front extensions on The Vale. However, I do not have full details of the circumstances that led to these proposals being accepted so cannot be sure that they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal. I have, in any case, determined the appeal based on its own planning merits.
10. The appellant has put forward that his desire for additional living space has been brought about by the prolonged period of staying at home during the Covid-19 pandemic. I am also aware that the effect of the proposal on other issues such as living conditions and highway safety have not been found to be objectionable by the Council. However, these matters would not outweigh or overcome the harm that I have identified above.
11. The proposal also includes a single storey rear extension and a front porch. These would be modest in size and scale and set well away from any

neighbouring windows. I therefore find no harm in respect of these elements of the proposal and I note that the Council has raised no objection in this regard either. The appellant has requested that a split decision be considered. As the proposed porch, rear extension and first floor front extensions are physically and functionally severable I consider a split decision would be a logical outcome.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the front porch and single storey rear extension are carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition requiring the external materials specified in the planning application form and the submitted plans be used in the construction of the single storey rear extension and front porch.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey extension to the rear and the front porch extension and dismissed insofar as it relates to the first floor front extension.

Mark Caine

INSPECTOR