



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2022

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30TH March 2022

Appeal Ref: T2350/D/22/3290796

20 Wellbrow Drive, Longridge, Preston, PR3 3TB

- 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 Mr T Howson against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 3/21/0969, dated 22 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is replacement front porch and dormer to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a replacement front porch and dormer to front at 20 Wellbrow Drive, Longridge, Preston, PR3 3TB in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 3/21/0969, dated 22 September 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan (un-numbered); Site Plan (un-numbered); Existing Ground Floor Plan 21-1221-1; Existing First Floor Plan 21-1221-2; Proposed Ground Floor Plan 21-1221-3; Proposed First Floor Plan 21-1221-4; Roof Plan 21-1221-5; Existing and Proposed Front Elevations 21-1221-6; South West Facing Elevations 21-1221-7; and North East Facing Elevations 21-1221-8.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling with a first-floor rear dormer, which is situated in a residential area. Dwellings in the vicinity of the site vary in terms of their age, scale and appearance. These include two-storey houses, bungalows and 'chalet style' properties with dormers at the front. Consequently, there is no distinctive or overriding character to the streetscene.

4. The proposal is to replace an existing entrance porch on the ground floor and construct a front-facing dormer. The Council does not object to the replacement porch, but considers the dormer to be incongruous and conspicuous, because of its width and overall size. With regard to the porch, I agree with the Council's assessment that it would be acceptable in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the area.
5. Policy DMG1 of the adopted Ribble Valley Core Strategy requires (amongst other things) the design of development to be of high quality and to be sympathetic in terms of its scale, massing and style. This policy accords with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (The Framework), which contains similar requirements.
6. Although the proposed dormer would be clearly visible on the front of the property, it would not appear overly dominant, because it would be set well-above the eaves level at the front of the dwelling. Much of the existing roof slope would remain and I consider that the structure would be a subservient addition to the property. The use of matching external materials would also ensure that its visual impact would be reduced. I accept that the proposal would result in the dwelling appearing different from the adjoining property, but given the modest scale of the dormer, I am not persuaded that this would be unacceptably harmful.
7. Therefore, I consider that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or on the streetscene. Consequently, it would not conflict with either the Development Plan or The Framework, as referred to above.

Conditions

8. The Council has suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. I have included these in my decision. In addition to the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and the list of approved plans, a condition is also imposed requiring the use of matching external materials. This is necessary to ensure a satisfactory external appearance.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be allowed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR