



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 August 2020

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/D/20/3253544

14 Garratt Close, Poulton-Le-Fylde, Lancashire FY6 7XG

- 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 Sykes against the decision of Wyre Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01232/FUL, dated 25 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 07 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is rear single storey extension, side 2 storey extension, conversion of garage into a garden room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The address in the application form is 14 Garratt Close, Poulton. However, in the interests of clarity I have adopted the completed address from the decision notice in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the residential occupiers of 11 Moorland Gardens, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a modern 2 storey semi-detached dwelling in a residential area. It is set at an angle in a large and irregularly shaped plot and it has a long side boundary adjoining the rear gardens of terraced properties on Moorland Gardens. There is a detached double garage with a pitched roof set forward and to the side of the front elevation of the property that provides parking for 12 and 14 Garratt Close.
5. The proposed garden room, formed by the conversion of the garage, would have bifold doors facing into the garden of the appeal property and it would be linked to the appeal property by a tall brick wall. Consequently, the bifold doors would not be visible from public viewpoints to the front of the property. Neither the garden room nor the wall, that would replace the existing tall close-boarded fence, would be detrimental to the street scene.
6. The proposed single storey flat roof rear extension would be the full width of the host property and it would project approximately 3m from the rear elevation. It would be a modest feature that would not overwhelm the host

- property. It would not result in any adverse visual impact and it would not be detrimental to neighbouring residential occupiers.
7. The 2 storey side extension would have single storey front and rear elevations with first floor accommodation provided in the tall pitched roof space above. It would extend beyond the main front elevation of No 14 and it would project sideways by approximately 5.4m. Notwithstanding that it would have eaves and ridge height below those of the host property, it would be a conspicuously large feature. Nevertheless, by virtue of its relative size, its design and materials to match its host, the side extension would appear subservient to No 14. Consequently, it would not harm the character and appearance of the appeal property.
 8. There would be no first floor side facing windows, and the windows in the rear roof slope that would serve a bathroom and dressing area would allow for only limited oblique overlooking at best towards the rears of properties on Moorland Gardens. Therefore, there would no direct or close overlooking and no loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupiers.
 9. However, the significant increase in the bulk of built development at the site would closely approach the shared boundary with the properties on Moorland Gardens. By virtue of its irregular siting relative to the properties on Moorland Gardens, the corner of the side extension would project towards the shared boundary and its side and rear elevations would be at oblique angle to the neighbouring properties. Nevertheless, by virtue of the short length of the neighbouring rear gardens, the proposal would be visually obtrusive when viewed from properties on Moorland Gardens, most particularly No 11.
 10. The side extension would result in some loss of light to the rear of neighbouring properties, although this would not be significantly detrimental. However, it would be overbearing to the neighbouring residential occupiers of No 11 when using their garden and it would diminish the outlook from the habitable room windows in the ground floor rear extension. I am not persuaded that different external materials, such as painted render, would mitigate the harm.
 11. Therefore, the proposal would harm the living conditions of the residential occupiers of 11 Moorland Gardens, with particular regard to outlook. It would conflict with Policy CDMP3 of the Wyre Local Plan 2011-2031 Adopted February 2019 in relation to avoiding unacceptable adverse impacts on the amenity of the occupants of surrounding or nearby properties. It would also conflict with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework that require proposals to promote health and well-being and high standards of residential amenity.

Other Matters

12. The limited scale of the proposal and the proposed surface water treatment would not result in significant flooding or drainage issues. Notwithstanding the loss of a garage parking space, there is sufficient alternate parking provision and the proposal is in an accessible location such that there would be no adverse impacts on highway safety. By virtue of the separation distance and their location in an area of public open space, the proposal would not result in adverse impacts on protected trees. These are requirements of the development plan and they do not weigh in favour of the scheme.

13. I appreciate that the scheme was amended, including in terms of its size and scale. While the decision will have been a disappointment to the appellant, nevertheless the amendments were not sufficient to address the concerns of the Council. Moreover, while I note concerns relating to the Council's virtual committee procedure, the Council was entitled to exercise its planning judgement and reach a conclusion contrary to the advice of its officers.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would result in conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR