



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) DipTP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/D/21/3284795
29A Alder Grove, Poulton-Le-Fylde FY6 8EJ

- 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 Matthew Broadhurst against the decision of Wyre Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00620/FUL, dated 6 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is First Floor Side Extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider that the main issues are the effect of the extension on:-
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, No 31 Alder Grove.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The area comprises a mix of detached houses which whilst there is some uniformity in their general character there are different house types. No 29, 29A and 31 for example are each of a different design. Despite their differences however, there are modest gaps between the houses and although these gaps are closed at ground floor level in a few cases, this is less evident at first floor level.
4. Local Plan Policy CDMP3¹ seeks to ensure that all development is of a high standard of design and will be assessed against a set of criteria. Amongst which is a requirement to respect or enhance the character of the area having regard to matters including layout, height, scale and massing. The National Planning Policy Framework² also supports good design. Supplementary

¹ Wyre Council – Wyre Local Plan (2011 – 2031) February 2019.

² Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, 2021 (the Framework).

Planning Document, Extending Your Home³ provides further guidance for house extensions and specifically includes advice for first floor side extensions. Amongst other things, the SPD advises that extensions should not dominate the original dwelling and should complement the general character of the surrounding area. The SPD also advises against the loss of a visual gap between properties in particular to avoid the appearance of linking semi-detached or detached dwellings.

5. The proposed first floor extension would enlarge the property up to the side boundary and thereby remove the existing space at first floor level between Nos 29A and 31. The extension would represent a substantial enlargement of the house which together with the resulting loss of space between the houses would be out of character with the surrounding area. As such, it would conflict with the objectives of Policy CDMP3, the SPD and the Framework.
6. I therefore find that on this issue, the proposed first floor side extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Living Conditions

7. The appeal site is a detached house with a flat roofed garage to the side. The proposed first floor extension would be above the garage and so would extend the house up to its boundary with the adjoining house, No 31. There are no first floor windows on the side elevation of No 31 and the garage already has an impact on ground floor windows and the side passage to No 31. Given the depth of the proposed extension and its roof design, I do not consider that it is likely that the occupiers would experience a loss of light. However, extending the house at first floor level so close to the shared boundary would have an enclosing impact and make the section of passage alongside the garage quite oppressive.
8. Included in the criteria for assessing a high standard of design, Policy CDMP3 requires that development must not have an unacceptably adverse impact on the amenity of the occupants and users of surrounding or nearby properties. The SPD also notes that extensions can have a noticeable impact on the amenities of neighbours by being overbearing and having an enclosing impact.
9. The proposal would have some impact on the occupiers of the adjacent property but it would be unlikely to result in a loss of light and any enclosing or overbearing impact would be limited to the area to the side of the house. In itself I do not consider that this is of a scale to warrant refusing permission. Having said this, the impact although modest would add weight against the proposal when taken with the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the area.
10. In this issue therefore, I conclude that the harm caused to the occupiers of the adjoining property, No 31, would be limited but adds weight against the proposal.

³ Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document Local Development Framework, Adopted November 2007 – Blackpool Council, Fylde Borough Council and Wyre Borough Council.

Other Matters and Conclusion

11. The appellant refers to other examples of other dwellings which have been extended at first floor level up to the side boundary and whilst I note these, they do not change my view that the character of the area is still largely that of dwellings spaced apart. I have considered all other matters raised but none alter my conclusion.
12. Whilst I have found that the extension would have some impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 31, that impact would be minimal and insufficient alone to reject this proposal. However, I have found that the extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and the impact on the neighbours would add weight against the proposal.
13. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with Local Plan Policy CDMP3, the SPD and the Framework especially with regard to its harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. The appeal therefore fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR