
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2022 by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N2345/D/22/3297861

22 Yew Tree Avenue, Grimsargh, Preston PR2 5LA

- 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 Ben Greenhow against the decision of Preston City Council.
 - The application Ref 06/2022/0180, dated 10 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Second Storey Side Extension and Single Storey Rear Extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The area immediately surrounding the appeal site is residential in character with the street scene formed of two storey and one and a half storey dwellings adjacent to but set back from the highway. Although there is a variation in house types within the wider area, there is a general consistency in the character of groups of these dwellings, positively contributing to the character of the street scene. Whilst a number of the dwellings surrounding the appeal site have been extended, the scale and design of these extensions facilitates a subservience to the host dwelling, preserving their character and that of the wider group.
5. The appeal property is detached, two storey, with a pitched roof and front gable adjacent to but set back from the highway. A single storey flat roofed garage adjoins the side elevation of the main dwelling, which is an unobtrusive and subservient feature of the dwelling and also within the street scene.
6. The Council have raised no objections to the proposed single storey extension and roof terrace. From the evidence before me I see no reason to take an alternative view. The disputed area of the proposal is therefore limited to the two-storey extension.

7. The proposal would involve raising the existing single storey garage to two storey and extending along the side elevation of the host dwelling, slightly recessed from the principal elevation. The proposed flat roof at two storey level would appear alien to the character of the existing area, with the use of flat roofs being limited to single storey.
8. The proposal creates an awkward interaction between the two-storey flat roof and the roof slope of the appeal property. This is particularly evident in the protrusion of the eaves above that of the host dwelling, eliminating the existing stepping down and subordination of extensions observed within the area. As such, the proposal would compete visually with the appeal property, unbalancing its existing character and that of the wider area.
9. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, wider area, and street scene. Accordingly, I find the proposal would conflict with the objectives of Chapter 10 of the Central Lancashire Adopted Core Strategy (2012), Policies AD1 (a), AD1 (b) and EN9 of the Preston Local Plan (Site Allocations & Development Management Policies) (2015), Saved Policies D13 and H8 of the Preston Local Plan (2004), and the Residential Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2013). Together these seek, amongst other things, to ensure that the design and scale of all new development is sensitive to, and in keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has cited the benefits of retaining the existing solar panels on the roof slope of the dwelling. I recognise that the ability to retain the solar panels must weigh in support of the proposal in the overall planning balance, but that the weight attributable would be limited due to the stated private nature of the benefit. Furthermore, whilst I have had regard to the appellant's stated intention to install an air source heat pump in the future and use sustainable products in the construction of the extension, I note that details of these have not been provided as a part of this proposed development, which must as a consequence limit any weight that may be attached to these factors.
11. As such, I do not consider these factors to outweigh the harm caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, wider area, and street scene.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, that outweigh this conflict.
13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR