



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2023

by J Smith MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F2360/D/23/3328998

52 St Cuthberts Road, Lostock Hall, Preston, Lancashire PR5 5TL

- 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 Mrs Maria T Johnson against the decision of South Ribble Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 07/2023/00353/HOH, dated 27 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey extension to side and porch extension to front of existing semi-detached property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.

Reasons

3. The host dwelling on the appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a single storey side extension which faces onto the corner junction of St Cuthberts Road. As a result, this turns the appeal dwelling away from the coherent building line along St Cuthberts Road. I note the point raised by the appellant that this would not allow a terracing effect to occur. This is a characteristic of other properties in the immediate vicinity which face onto this corner of St Cuthberts Road. The appeal property in this configuration is in close proximity to the adjacent neighbour of 54 St Cuthberts Road. The wider area is characterised by dwellings of a similar appearance which follow a strong established building line along St Cuthberts Road and face onto the playing field situated opposite these dwellings.
4. This appeal proposes a two-storey element which would sit forward of the established building line along St Cuthberts Road. This would appear incongruous within the street scene. Additionally, this side extension would have no set back or set down of the roof ridge and the width of the extension would be slightly less than that of the width of the host dwelling. This would appear as a dominating structure and would not be subservient in its relationship to the host dwelling. This large addition to the side elevation of the appeal property would also contribute to unbalancing a pair of semi-detached properties.
5. Policies B1 and G17 of the South Ribble Borough Council Local Plan 2012 – 2026 (LP) expect proposals to not have a detrimental impact on the existing

building or on the street scene by virtue of its height, scale and design. The South Ribble Residential Extensions SPD 2013 (SPD) provides guidance on the design of house extensions. Design Guidance Notes DG01 and DG05 require extensions to be set back 1.0m from the main elevation. The guidance advises that extensions shall employ setbacks to ensure subservience and to reflect an element of change, such as an extension to a property. The Design Guidance Notes also state that proposals shall not result in the creation or introduction of an incongruous form of development that is of detriment to the host building or wider street scene.

6. To conclude, this proposal would create a highly visible two storey extension, situated forward of the established building line, with no set back or set down and would be an overtly large addition due to the width of the extension. The combination of these factors would create an incongruous feature within the street scene and on the host dwelling. As such, the proposal would not accord with Policies B1 or G17 of the LP and the guidance found within the SPD. Therefore, I find that the proposed development would not comply with the development plan, when read as a whole.

Other Matters

Extensions to other properties

7. The appellant has highlighted five properties in the wider vicinity that have similar extensions to the proposal subject to this appeal. I note that the officer report for 75 Lourdes Avenue and the decision notice for 47 St Cuthberts Road has been provided. I do not consider that the officer report provided for 75 Lourdes Avenue is complete. I have not been provided with any information regarding the other properties highlighted by the appellant. However, I was able to view these properties on my site visit from the public highway.
8. 47 St Cuthberts Road is located on the opposite corner to the appeal site. The physical difference here is that 47 does not have a neighbouring property in close proximity to its side elevation. Therefore, this property does not step forward of the building line in such a noticeable way as the appeal site would. 1 New Road is located a short distance away from the appeal site and is situated on a corner plot adjacent to St Cuthberts Road. This property holds a similar site layout to 47 St Cuthberts Road. There is no neighbouring property within close proximity to the side elevation unlike the appeal property and therefore, the building line is not compromised in a noticeable way.
9. 26 St Cuthberts Road makes a semi-detached pair with 1 New Road. This extension is different to the appeal proposal as the extension to this property follows the building line set by the properties adjacent to it. 75 Lourdes Avenue is situated at the end of a row of semi-detached properties. The next line of properties on Ampleforth Drive are not read in connection with this property due to the corner that has to be turned in the street scene. The Applebee Wood School is situated on this corner. This building breaks the two building lines of Lourdes Avenue and Ampleforth Drive and therefore the two are not noticeably connected. 7 Marina Drive is located in the middle of a row of semi-detached properties. As found within wider vicinity, there is a strong building line set by neighbouring properties. The extension constructed here does not protrude forwards of this building line unlike the proposal subject to this appeal.

Personal circumstances

10. The personal circumstances of the appellant and their family are acknowledged, including that the proposal would allow family members to live at 52 St Cuthberts Road with care provided by the appellant. I also note that the appellant provides childcare to younger family members.
11. In considering this matter, I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which requires me to consider the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. Protected characteristics include a person's age and disability.
12. In this regard, the above exercise must be weighed against my conclusion on the main issue that the proposal would cause a significant harm upon the character and appearance of the area.
13. I am sympathetic to the needs of the appellant and their family. However, I am not persuaded from the information before me, that the appeal proposal represents the only option by which the necessary additional living accommodation could be achieved by the appellant without there being a lesser adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.
14. In this case, and for the reasons set out, a refusal of planning permission is a proportionate and necessary approach to the legitimate aim of ensuring that significant harm is not caused to the character and appearance of the area and host dwelling. Indeed, the protection of the public interest cannot be achieved by means that are less interfering of the human rights of the family members. Therefore, while I acknowledge the personal circumstances of the appellant, I conclude that these are not matters which outweigh the harm that is caused by the development.

Car parking and living conditions of neighbouring properties

15. Both parties have assessed the implications of the proposal on car parking and on the living conditions of neighbouring properties. I note that the Council raise no objection to the proposal in these regards. Therefore, I have assessed the proposal against the main issue between both parties.

Conclusion

16. To conclude, I have found harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

J Smith

INSPECTOR