



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2023

by J Smith MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N2345/D/23/3327962

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 Taufik Nagdawala against the decision of Preston City Council.
 - The application Ref 06/2023/0345, dated 29 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is Two storey side extension, single and two storey rear extensions, replacement windows and front door, replacement render to existing dwelling, and detached outbuilding, following demolition of existing single storey rear outrigger and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Planning and Heritage Statement provided by the appellant notes that permission was granted in a previous application for a rear dormer. However, a dormer is not included on the appeal description or is included in the plans submitted. Therefore, I have not taken a dormer into account.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is if the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene, and if the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Fulwood Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal property is situated in the Fulwood CA. It is noted in the evidence before me that the CA was designated in 2008 and is defined by tall and imposing red brick buildings, garden spaces and leafy edged pavements. The appeal property is located in Character Zone 3 of the CA. Character Zone 3 is different from other zones in the CA as properties were built as suburban developments of the inter-war years. As noted in my site visit, there are a mixture of two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings, single storey bungalows and terraced properties with red brick or rendered exteriors and notable gaps between each property. These gaps are not overly large but positively help to create space between properties in the street scene.
5. The host dwelling holds a prominent position within the street scene due to the staggered building line along Fulwood Hall Lane. This sits the host dwelling forward of the neighbouring property of No. 18. This results in a high visibility of the side elevation of the appeal proposal when viewed from the north. In

this situation, the two-storey side extension would appear prominent as it would sit forward of No. 18, with a large projection into the rear of the site. This would erode the gap which exists between the two properties. The proposal would have an overly large appearance in relation to the host dwelling and in the CA and would also narrow the gap to the neighbouring property of No. 18.

6. It is the combination of the reduction of the gap between No. 16 and 18, the visibility of the side elevation of the proposal and its size from the north, attached to the host dwelling with a long projection in a visibly prominent position which I find would harm the host dwelling and CA. To conclude, the proposed size of the extension would significantly harm the appearance of the property and would erode its notable gap between No. 18, in a prominent position within the conservation area.
7. The Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2013 (SPD) requires extensions to have a setback of 1.5m from the front elevation, not exceed 50% of the width of the original dwelling and must have a lower ridge height than that of the main dwelling. I have noted that the proposed side extension would comply with these requirements. This would contribute to creating a subordinate addition. However, I also find that the proposal would not respect the character of the CA and therefore would conflict with the guidelines in the SPD relating to development in sensitive areas.
8. This appeal proposes an outbuilding to the rear of the site. The Council note that this will not be easily viewed from the CA. This appeal also proposes the removal of a front porch. The Council have not found harm to these aspects of the proposal, and I have no reason to disagree.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Furthermore, I find that the proposed development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA and would result in 'less than substantial' harm, when assessed against the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework. I do not find any public benefits that would outweigh this harm in this case.
10. Therefore, the development would not be in accordance with Policies AD1(a), EN8 and EN9 of the Adopted Preston Local Plan 2012-26 (Site Allocations and Development Management Policies), Policy 16 of the Adopted Central Lancashire Core Strategy and saved Policies D13 and H8 of the Preston Local Plan (2004). These policies seek to safeguard heritage assets from development which would cause harm to their significance, ensure that development is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and that the host property is not adversely affected, amongst other things.

Other Matters

11. In their statement, the appellant has highlighted examples of modern extensions in the surrounding area. I have not been provided with the decision notice or officer report for these examples and whilst I was able to see them during my site visit, each proposal is to be determined on its own site specific considerations.

Conclusion

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

J Smith MRTPI

INSPECTOR