



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N2345/D/24/3354982

13 Stuart Road, Ribbleton, Preston PR2 6AD

- 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 Zubair Wadi against the decision of Preston City Council.
 - The application Ref is 06/2024/0640.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable roof enlargement and rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the development was in situ. The application has been submitted retrospectively; I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on (i) the character and appearance of the area and the host property itself; and (ii) the living conditions of neighbouring properties.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached property within a predominantly residential area characterised by predominantly traditional two-storey properties. Properties in the area vary in terms of design, however semi-detached properties within the immediate area, in general, share similar features such as hipped roof design which create a symmetrical appearance. Notwithstanding this some properties in the area have been extended or altered.
5. The Council do not raise concern with regard to the hip to gable roof alteration, from the information before me I agree.
6. The L-shaped dormer is large, covering the rear roof plane, including that of the two-storey outrigger. The dormer extends beyond the side of gable of the property, the dormer can be viewed from public vantage points and dominates the rear elevation.

7. The mass of the dormer is substantial in scale and is not subordinated to the host property. Overall, the dormer is a discordant disproportionate addition, incongruous to the existing property and the area in general.
8. The cladding used for the dormer introduces another material to the built form of the property, which consists mainly of red brick to the ground floor and white render/pebbledash to the first floor. The dark cladding further emphasises the imposing top-heavy addition to the property.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and the host property itself. There is conflict with Policies AD1(a) and EN9 of the Preston Local Plan 2012-26, Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2015) (the Allocations & Development Management Plan); and Policies D13 and H8 of the Preston Local Plan (2004) (the Local Plan) which seek to ensure that amongst other things developments respect the existing property and surrounding area.
10. There is also conflict with the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2013) which seeks amongst other things that developments are sympathetic to the property whilst respecting the streetscene.

Living Conditions

11. The appeal site has limited rear private amenity space due to the depth of the garden area. The proposed development elongates the built form creating a dominant mass.
12. Due to the relationship between the appeal site and neighbouring properties in particular No's 22 and 24 Moorfield Drive which face the rear elevation and No. 15 Stuart Road, the adjoining property, the dormer is prominent and overbearing in terms of outlook for the neighbouring occupiers, which would diminish the enjoyment of their property and private amenity space.
13. I conclude that the proposed development would harm living conditions of occupants of neighbouring properties. There would be conflict with Policy AD1(a) of the Allocations & Development Management Plan, Policies D13 and H8 of the Local Plan which seek amongst other things to protect the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties. There is also conflict with the SPD which echoes the Development Plan policies.

Other Matters

14. The appellant has raised procedural concerns relating to the determination of the application in relation to the lack of contact between the Council and the appellant in an attempt to overcome the issues. The development before me is retrospective, it is understandable that the Council determined the application basis on the information before them. Nevertheless, this is beyond the remit of this appeal and does not influence my findings.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR