



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2021

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13TH December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/D/21/3281983

6 Stockdove Wood, Thornton Cleveleys FY5 2JP

- 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 K Buckley against the decision of Wyre Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00444/FUL, dated 20 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is extension to existing garage.
-

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 surrounding area.
 - the living conditions of the neighbours at No.7 Stockdove Wood with regard outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. No.6 Stockdove Wood (No.6) is a two-storey detached dwelling which has an existing double garage that sits forward of the front elevation. It is proposed to extend at ground floor to the side of the existing garage and over its full width at first-floor. The existing pyramid roof of the garage is around 4.55m in height and this would be replaced with a pitched roof and a facing gable with first-floor window to Stockdove Wood. The height of the proposed roof would be over 6m and its height, scale and massing would be significantly larger than the existing garage appearing a two-storey addition to the host dwelling.
4. The extension has been designed so that the ridge of the pitched roof is lower than the main dwelling and I note it would consume an existing car port to the side at ground floor. However, its width and height, combined with its siting, means it would be a bulky addition that dominates, rather than appears subordinate to, the host dwelling. It would therefore conflict with Design Guidance 1B of the Council's *Extending your Home Supplementary Planning Document (2007)* (SPD) that the bulk and scale of an extension should appear subordinate to the original property, or not result in a built form that is overly dominant and out of scale with its immediate context.

5. I saw from my site visit that there is some variety of design of dwellings in Stockdove Wood. No.6 is however located at the head of the cul-de-sac where dwellings are similar in their design, with garages that have either a pyramid or hipped roof, are all single storey and appear genuinely ancillary to the main dwelling. Appearing as a two-storey addition to the front of the host dwelling, the proposed garage extension would appear particularly incongruous in this context.
6. I recognise that the neighbour at No.7 has been extended over two-storeys to the side to include an integral garage and therein its scale and massing has been significantly increased. However, No.7 fronts Stockdove Wood, is set forward of the building line of No.6, and is different in style and design to those dwellings at the head of the cul-de-sac. In character and appearance, No.7 better relates to the dwelling opposite on Stockdale Wood and those on the corner of Stockdale Wood and West Drive. I do not therefore find it to be directly comparable to the appeal property or that the extension of No.7 justifies the scale of the extension now before me.
7. On the first main issue, I conclude that the proposed extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and Policy CDMP3 of the Wyre Local Plan (2011-2031) (February 2019) (LP) which together require all new development to respect or enhance the local character of an area.

Living conditions

8. The proposed extension to the garage over ground and first-floor would project close to the common boundary with No.7 Stockdove Wood. It would have a blank gable facing elevation to the boundary at around 6.2m to its ridge and 3.3m to its eaves. There are windows at ground and first-floor in the side elevation of No.7 but the first-floor window is obscure glazed and is a secondary window to a bedroom which has its principal window to the front. As described above, No.7 is set forward of the appeal property and although extending close to the common boundary, the relative siting of the two dwellings means the proposed extension would not cause significant harm to the outlook of the windows of No.7 at either ground or first-floor.
9. The extension to the garage would be to the immediate south of No.7 and because of this orientation, and its height, there would be an increase in overshadowing of the southern part of the garden closest to the dwelling. However, only a small part of the proposed extension projects beyond the existing rear building line of the appeal property and I am not therefore persuaded that this would result in a loss of light to either the garden or rear windows of No.7 such that it would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers. For similar reasons, the extension, whilst visible, would not appear particularly overbearing from the principal windows to the rear of No.7.
10. Consequently, I do not find the proposed extension would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No.7. There would therefore be no conflict with LP Policy CMP3 in so far as it requires development to not unacceptably impact the amenity of occupants and users of nearby properties. Further, there would be no conflict with SPD Design Guidance 1C or 1D in this regard or the guidance at paragraph 130 of the Framework that developments should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusions

11. Whilst I have not found harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No.7, I nonetheless find significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. For the reasons given above, and taking all other matters into account, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

R Jones

INSPECTOR