



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2024

by **K Mansell BA (Hons) MPhil TP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F2360/D/24/3353148

31 Hazel Close, Penwortham, Preston, Lancashire, PR1 0YE

- 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 Mr and Mrs Nick and Jill Howe against the decision of South Ribble Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 07/2024/00394/HOH.
 - The development proposed is described as 'first floor – up and over bedroom/s extension attached to side of linked detached dwelling above existing ground floor single storey extension on side'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Hazel Close is an established residential cul-de-sac of two-storey mainly link detached brick houses connected typically by single storey garages. There is an evident uniformity to their appearance, being of broadly similar size and style. The dwellings also follow a reasonably consistent building line, being modestly set back from the road behind a front garden and/or driveway with a slightly longer garden to the rear. Corner properties typically have a wider garden to the side. The repeating form created by the siting and link detached design of the houses provides order and consistency to the pattern of development along the street, which adds positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The appeal property at No 31 occupies a corner plot. It faces Hazel Close to the front with its side boundary adjoining Cherry Wood, from which the flank elevation of the dwelling can be seen. No 31 has been previously enlarged. This includes a two-storey side extension, with an additional single-storey extension built onto it. The appeal proposal would add a first-floor side extension above this existing single-storey addition.
5. Even though the appeal scheme would not increase the dwelling's footprint or diminish its garden size, the cumulative effect of the first-floor addition and the current side extensions to No 31 would be a two-storey side extension that would be more than twice the width of the two-storey section of the original house. Despite the fact that it would be substantially set back from No 31's front building line, the

combined visual effect would be an extension that would add significant bulk and massing to the property. It would appear disproportionate and unsympathetic to the scale and form of the original host dwelling and fail to complement its appearance. It would therefore be visually harmful. The use of matching materials and design detail would not overcome this harm.

6. Furthermore, the first-floor extension would bring the two-storey flank elevation of No 31 closer to its side boundary with Cherry Wood. This would contrast to the two-storey side elevation of 10 Cherry Wood on the opposite corner to No 31, which is set further within the site and contributes to a degree of spaciousness along the street. The appeal scheme would also noticeably project forward of the front building line of dwellings on Cherry Wood to its rear. As a consequence of its corner location, it would therefore be prominent when viewed from the street. It would result in the extension appearing overly dominant in combination with the existing additions and visually obtrusive within the street scene, leading to the appearance of the plot's over-development. It would consequently not make a positive contribution to the host dwelling or local character.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to other extended corner properties in the area. However, in contrast to the appeal scheme and its cumulative impact with the existing side projections, the two-storey and first-floor extensions to 34 Birch Avenue, 33 Beechway and 2 Rowan Close do not exceed the width of the original house. Whilst 25 Hornbeam Close has been substantially enlarged, unlike Cherry Wood to the rear of the appeal property, the eastern edge of Blackthorn Drive lacks a strong continuous building line. The two-story side extension to No 25 is less prominent as a result. The two-storey extension to 43 Whitefield Road is to the rear rather than to the side. For these reasons, I do not find these cases to be directly comparable with the appeal proposal and they have not altered my overall decision. In any event, I must consider it on its individual merits.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the appeal scheme would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy G17 of the South Ribble Borough Council Local Plan (2015) which seeks to ensure, amongst other matters, that new development has regard to existing buildings and the street scene in its design, scale and massing.

Other Matters

9. I recognise that the works would create additional bedroom space for the appellant to meet their needs, including their extended family, and those of future occupiers and particularly those of larger households. However, even if it would represent an efficient use of the site, planning decisions are taken in the public interest. Such personal circumstances do not, in my view, outweigh the harm to the host dwelling and the character of the area that I have identified.
10. I have also had regard to guidance within the Framework and recognise that there may be some social, economic and environmental benefits arising from the appeal scheme. These include providing income for builders and building suppliers and the opportunity for a full roof of south facing solar panels. However, these potential gains have not been quantified and attract limited weight as a result. I have also been referred to the potential for a rise in Council Tax, but there is no evidence that this would be the case. In any event, given the very modest scale of the appeal scheme as a residential extension, these benefits would be limited and would not

outweigh the substantial harm that I have identified. Nor does the absence of any identified harm by the Council to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, or highway or ecological impacts, justify development that would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

11. The appeal proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations that would indicate a decision otherwise would be appropriate. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Mansell

INSPECTOR