



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2025

by Mark Caine BSc (Hons) MTPL MRTPI LSRA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N2345/W/24/3347614

13 Lytham Road, Preston, Lancashire PR2 8JE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mua Ventures Ltd against the decision of Preston City Council.
 - The application Ref is 06/2023/1380.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The proposal was amended following its submission to the Council but prior to its determination. These changes, shown in the revised plans have resulted in a reduction in the size and scale of the proposed extension. I am satisfied that all relevant parties have had the opportunity to comment on these amendments and would not be prejudiced. Therefore, I have determined the appeal taking account of the revised plans as amendments to the original application submission.
3. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework was published on 12 December 2024. The content of the revised Framework has been considered but in light of the facts in this case it does not alter my conclusion.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal relates to a two-storey hipped roof property, which is partly in retail use at ground floor level. Whilst there are some other commercial and community buildings nearby it is situated in a predominantly residential area next to the junction of Lytham Road and Brackenbury Road. It also has a wide double-fronted shopfront to take advantage of its corner location.
6. There is some variety in the style and materials of the properties in the area and a few of these are positioned closer to the Lytham Road highway than No 13. However, most buildings on the western side of Brackenbury Road are set back from this highway and follow a broadly linear building line which results in a relatively well-ordered spacious layout and appearance. Due to the topography of the area Brackenbury Road also gradually rises up to the appeal site. As a result of these factors and its prominent corner location, No 13's rear and gable

elevations appear elevated and exposed when approaching from the southern direction.

7. The proposed extension would be set back from the front face of No 13 and be of a modest footprint and scale when compared to this host building. Accordingly, it would not represent a disproportionate addition. Nonetheless, it would project outwardly from the gable elevation of No 13 towards the back edge of the Brackenbury Road footway. This projection, when combined with the proposal's uncharacteristic monopitch roof design, and its exposed raised location, would disrupt the building line to the extent that it would appear jarring and conspicuous along Brackenbury Road.
8. It would also significantly alter and interrupt the shopfront, building over an entire side display window, thereby converting it from a double to a single frontage. This would fail to take account of the scale, proportion and overall design of the shopfront, and would introduce an intrusive, disjointed and discordant feature. Conflict would therefore arise with advice contained within the Council's Shopfront Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (SPD) in this regard.
9. The discordant nature of the proposal would be plainly visible from Lytham Road, Brackenbury Road and the windows of neighbouring properties. The use of matching materials along with the existing hedgerow and boundary treatment, which only encloses part of the site, would not provide sufficient mitigation to overcome this harm. Although there are other single storey extensions in the area these are largely to the rear of properties and do not share the same site characteristics to those that apply in this case.
10. As such, I find that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It thereby conflicts with Policies AD1 (a) and EN9 of the Preston Local Plan 2012-26 (2015) and Policy 17 of the Central Lancashire Adopted Core Strategy 2012, and advice within the SPD. Together these require, amongst other things, that the siting, layout and scale of development positively contributes to the character and appearance of the local area through high quality new design.

Other Matters

11. It has not been clearly demonstrated that the proposal is the only practical means of enhancing security on the site. As such, this factor would not outweigh or overcome the harm that I have identified and would not constitute sustainable development for which there is a presumption in favour.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations that warrant taking a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Mark Caine

INSPECTOR