



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2021

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N2345/D/21/3280797

1A Princes Drive, Fulwood, Preston, PR2 9XG

- 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 Clifton Taylor against the decision of Preston City Council.
 - The application Ref 06/2021/0480, dated 26 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension including loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development, firstly, on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, secondly, on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 289a Garstang Road with regard to overlooking and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a detached house on the southern side of Princes Drive. It is the last property on this side of the street before the junction with Garstang Road, and its eastern elevation is therefore relatively prominent.
4. The development proposes a large rear dormer extension that would occupy the full width and height of the roof slope. This would extend out from the ridge and would be level with the flank walls on either side, which would create the appearance of a 3 storey flat roof building from the rear. This would significantly alter the appearance of the property, particularly at the rear and in views along the street from the east. From these positions, the proposed extension would appear as an overly large and bulky feature that would contrast sharply with the surrounding properties. In this regard, the lack of any set in from the flank walls would result in an unsympathetic appearance that would draw the eye.
5. The Council's Residential Alterations & Extensions Supplementary Planning Document ('SPD') (2013) provides specific guidance in relation to roof extensions and dormers. In this regard, part SP9 of the SPD states that dormers should "*be contained well within the body of the roof by being well set*

back from the party/end walls, below the ridge of the roof and above the eaves gutter line". The development would be contrary to this guidance, which would result in an unacceptable appearance in this case. Whilst No 10 on the opposite side of the road has a rear dormer, that extension is contained within the body of the roof and is set in from the flank walls. Moreover, it is far less prominent within the street than the current proposal.

6. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of both the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to the relevant sections of saved Policies H8 and D13 of the Preston Local Plan (2004), Policies AD1(a) and EN9 of the Preston Local Plan (Site Allocations and Development Management Policies) (2015), and guidance contained in the Residential Alterations & Extensions SPD (2013). These policies and guidance seek to ensure that the design and scale of development is sensitive to, and in keeping with, the character and appearance of the area.

Living conditions

7. The development would introduce a new rear facing window in close proximity to the boundary with No 289a Garstang Road, which would look out over the rear garden to that property. However, this window would serve a small hallway and staircase only, and so could be obscurely glazed in order to avoid any direct overlooking of No 289a. This could be secured by condition, which would avoid any loss of privacy to the occupiers of that property.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 289a Garstang Road with regard to overlooking and privacy. It would therefore accord with the relevant sections of saved Policies H8 and D13 of the Preston Local Plan (2004), Policy AD1(a) of the Preston Local Plan (Site Allocations and Development Management Policies) (2015), and guidance contained in the Residential Alterations & Extensions SPD (2013), which seek to protect neighbouring residential amenity.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of both the host property and the surrounding area. Whilst it would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 289a Garstang Road, and would generate some modest economic benefits, that does not alter my view that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR