



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2023

by S R G Baird BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 01 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N2345/D/22/3305487

110 Deepdale Road, Preston Lancashire PR1 5AR

- 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 T Daud against the decision of Preston City Council.
 - The application Ref 06/2022/0559, dated 14 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is proposed rear dormer and a first-floor rear extension.
-

Preliminary Matter

1. The rear dormer has been constructed.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

3. The effects on, the appearance of the area having regard to the location of No. 110 in the Deepdale Enclosure Conservation Area (CA), and the occupiers of No. 108 Deepdale Road with reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The development plan comprises The Central Lancashire Core Strategy (CS), the Preston Local Plan 2012-2026 (PLP) and saved policies of the Preston Local Plan 2004 (LP). CS Policy 16, PLP Policies EN8 and EN9 and saved LP Policies D13 and H8 seek high quality design that is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and conserves the appearance of the CA.
5. The Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is a material consideration. In addition to seeking the use of high quality design and materials, SPD Policy SP 9 indicates that dormers should be well contained within the body of the roof, by being well set back from the party/end walls, below the ridge and above the eaves with finishing materials that match the roofing materials of the host property. Dormers should be constructed with pitched roofs and not clad in board or plastic. Proposals within CAs should use appropriate materials, scale, form, and massing.
6. The dormer is L-shaped, has an almost flat roof, spans the full width and height of the rear/side facing roof planes of the main dwelling/2-storey outrigger and is finished in dark grey, what appears to be, plastic board. Given the form, scale and finish of the dormer, this substantial dormer fails to comply with the

SPD guidance. Rather than appearing as subservient to the host dwelling, the works are akin to a second-floor flat roof extension. In views from, Deepdale Road to the north, Peel Hall and Carrol Streets to the side and Golbourne Street to the rear, the dormer is a prominent feature above the adjoining buildings. In these views, the dormer is an obtrusive and incongruous feature in the street scene unacceptably affecting the appearance of the area. The first-floor extension would be finished in the same dark grey boarding as the dormer. Whilst the bulk of the extension would be screened in some views from Peel Hall Street by the outrigger to the rear of Nos. 112/114, it would appear obtrusive and incongruous feature from Golbourne and Carrol Streets. The dormer and first-floor extension would not preserve the appearance of the CA and there are no public benefits that would outweigh this harm. The scale, form and finish of the dormer and proposed first-floor extension conflict with CS Policy 16, PLP Policies EN8 and EN9 and saved LP policies D13 and H8.

Effect on 108 Deepdale Road

7. PLP Policy AD1(a) and saved LP Policies D13 and H8 say that extensions will be permitted where they do not adversely affect the amenities of neighbouring residential properties. The SPD advises that extensions should be designed so that they are not dominant or overbearing. SPD Policy SP5 advises that a first-floor extension must not project more than 2.5m from the main rear wall.
8. Here, the concern is that the dormer over the outrigger is dominant and overbearing when seen from the rear yard and side windows of No. 108. Whilst the Council highlights that the rearward projection of first-floor extension would conflict with the SPD guidelines, it indicates that the current situation would not be exacerbated. I disagree, the first-floor extension, given its form, depth and finish would, in combination with the dormer, appear dominant and overbearing unacceptably affecting the occupiers of No.108. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with PLP Policy AD1(a) and saved LP Policies D13 and H8.

Conclusions

9. For the above reasons and taking all other matters into consideration, the dormer has and the first-floor extension would have an unacceptable effect on the occupiers of No. 108, the appearance of the area and fail to preserve the appearance of the CA. As such the scheme would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole and the appeal is dismissed.

George Baird

Inspector