



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/21/3284775

16 Fulwood Hall Lane, Preston, PR2 8DB

- 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 Taufik Nagdawala against the decision of Preston City Council.
 - The application Ref 06/2021/0487, dated 25 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2021.
 - The development is described as *"erection of two storey side & rear extension + single storey rear extensions + rear dormer following demolition of existing single storey rear extension and outbuilding"*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Fulwood Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is within the Fulwood Conservation Area, which encompasses a historic residential area that dates mainly to the Victorian period and early 20th Century. It is characterised by attractive red brick buildings, generous plot sizes, and leafy edges to the pavements. Its significance stems from its well-preserved buildings and spaces that reflect the development of the area as an early suburb of Preston.
4. The appeal property is within a part of the conservation area that was built during the inter-war period, and the surrounding houses are characteristic of suburban development of this era. Whilst there is significant variation in the design of properties along Fulwood Hall Lane, most are reflective of that period. The appeal property itself is a pleasant semi-detached house that contributes to the character of this part of the conservation area.
5. The proposed extensions would have a distinctly contemporary appearance and would include a new main entrance at the side with full height glazing above. This would significantly alter the appearance of the frontage and the proposed expanse of glazing would visually jar with the traditional character of the host property. It would be unlike any other feature in the street, and it would have an unsympathetic appearance that would draw the eye. The relocation of the

- main entrance and installation of a window into the existing door opening would further detract from the traditional character of the dwelling and would have a discordant appearance. Moreover, the proposed replacement windows would lack top lights, which would contrast sharply with the surrounding properties. Whilst I note that No 7 has similar windows to those currently proposed, it is unclear from the information before me whether they are lawful. In this regard, the Officer Report refers to an Article 4 Direction that restricts permitted development rights in the conservation area.
6. Due to the staggered building line in this location the side extension would be prominent in the street, particularly in views from the north. From these positions, it would have an overly large and imposing appearance that would significantly narrow the gap to No 18. Given its size and design, the extension would significantly harm the appearance of the property and would erode its traditional character, in a prominent position within the conservation area.
 7. It is asserted that the development would meet the criteria set out in part SP1 of the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document ('SPD') (2013). However, the SPD also states that "*proposals within Conservation Areas must respect the character of the area through maintaining high quality design detail by the use of appropriate materials, scale, form and massing*". Moreover, the SPD does not negate the requirements of other local policies relating to heritage and design.
 8. My attention has also been drawn to a number of modern developments and extensions in the surrounding area. In this regard, the side extension to No 1 Allenby Avenue is a far less prominent feature which reflects the design and materials of the host property. With regard to the glazed entrance feature at No 2 Allenby Avenue, this is significantly smaller and centrally located, and is dissimilar from the current proposal in these respects. In terms of the recently constructed house at No 23a, this is a sympathetically designed infill scheme set within a tighter grain of development on the opposite side of the road.
 9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Fulwood Conservation Area. This harm would be 'less than substantial' in the context of Paragraphs 201-202 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'). However, there are no public benefits that would outweigh the harm in this case.
 10. The development would therefore be contrary to Policy 16 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy (2012), Policies AD1(a), EN8, EN9 of the Preston Local Plan (Site Allocations and Development Management Policies) (2015), saved Policies D13 and H8 of the Preston Local Plan (2004), and guidance contained in the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD. It would also be at odds with the Framework relating to designated heritage assets.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR