



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2018

by **G J Fort BA PGDip LLM MCD MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 September 2018

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/D/18/3201777**  
**119 West Drive, Thornton Cleveleys, FY5 2JE**

- 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 Nuttall against the decision of Wyre Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 18/00267/FUL, dated 13 March 2018, was refused by notice dated 2 May 2018.
  - The development proposed is a conservatory to the side of a semi-detached bungalow.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. The Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government issued the new National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 24 July 2018, which replaced the version relevant at the date of the Council's decision on the application that led to this appeal. The Framework establishes<sup>1</sup> that it is a material consideration in planning decisions from the day of its publication. Accordingly, I sought comments from the parties on the bearing of the Framework on the current case. I therefore consider that no prejudice would occur to any interests as a result of me taking the Framework into account in an assessment of the planning merits of the case.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings.

### Reasons

4. Situated in a prominent position at the corner of a cross roads, the appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow the hipped roof, brick-facing, and balance and regularity of the street-facing elevations of which impart an uncomplicated appearance. With its front and flank walls set back from the roads behind pleasantly landscaped gardens, the appeal property is part of a streetscene of an intrinsically suburban character. Whilst I saw two-storey dwellings in the wider surroundings of the appeal property, bungalows are predominant within its immediate environs.

---

<sup>1</sup> At paragraphs 2 and 212

5. The proposed development would introduce a conservatory which would extend along the full depth of the appeal property's flank wall. It would feature a glazed hipped roof off set from its centre, with a feature labelled on the plan as a 'box gutter' at the junction of the proposed development and the appeal property. Its elevations would include brick-facing, with extensive glazing on its front and side, with the rear wall lacking in structural openings. I am mindful of the appellant's comments that the design emerged following discussions with the occupants of neighbouring properties- I also note that no objections were made to the proposal at application stage and indeed some letters of support were submitted.
6. Nevertheless, due to its depth and lack of setback from the front corner of the appeal property, the proposed conservatory would lack subservience and appear as a dominant addition. Moreover, the mismatch of eaves heights and the presence of the flat box gutter element at the junction between the existing and proposed roofs would result in a cluttered complexity to this visually prominent part of the building at variance with the appeal property's simple appearance.
7. The proposed development's discordant effects in this regard would be exacerbated by the glazed roof's off-centre placement in the context of its front elevation and the resultant imbalanced appearance this would impart. The proposed development would therefore read as an incongruous addition to the property and neither the use of matching materials in its facing nor the employment of a reputable local contractor in its construction would overcome this incongruity. Moreover, due to the appeal property's prominent siting the conservatory would read as a visually jarring element of the streetscene.
8. I note that the appellant does not wish to introduce additional screening in the garden in the interests of highway safety close to the junction, but considers that over time recently planted ferns would serve to screen the proposed development. However, whilst the planting may obscure some limited views of the proposed development, it could take some time for the plants to become established, and moreover, the proposed development would still be visible within the streetscene once the ferns have matured. Consequently, these considerations do not override my main concerns.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to other developments in the wider surroundings of the appeal site. I saw that the bungalow at the corner of West Drive and Amounderness Way is of a contemporary character; however, it has a similar scale and plot size to the bungalows to its side, and thus assimilates with its immediate streetscene in these regards. The single-storey side extension referenced on Stockdove Way relates to a two-storey property, and thus does not share the visually jarring roof relationship or the dominant character of the proposed development in this case. Moreover, each proposal needs to be considered on its own planning merits. Consequently, neither of these developments serves as a precedent for the proposed conservatory in this case due to the clearly more discordant effects it would have.
10. Accordingly, taking these considerations together leads me to the conclusion on this main issue that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of its host dwelling and its surroundings. For these reasons it would conflict with Policies SP14 and H4 of Wyre's Local Plan (adopted July 1999); the Framework; and the Blackpool, Fylde and Wyre

*Extending your Home* Supplementary Planning Document (adopted November 2007). Taken together, and amongst other things, the policies and guidance seek high standards of design in extensions that are sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment and appropriate and proportionate in scale and character to their original dwellings.

### **Other Matters**

11. The host dwelling's garden is well-cared for, and I note references to others in the area that the appellant considers to be unkempt. However, it has not been demonstrated that these matters relate to the planning merits of the current proposal.
12. I note that siting a conservatory at the rear of the host dwelling could lead to a reduction in garden space, and that the proposed development would not have the same level of effect in these regards. Moreover, the amount of off-street parking would not be reduced as a result of the proposal. The proposed development could avoid harmful effects to the occupants of neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking and outlook. Nevertheless, these matters merely evidence a lack of harmful effects in these terms rather than positive benefits of the appeal scheme and thus have only a neutral effect on the overall planning balance.
13. For these reasons, none of these other matters alter my conclusions in respect of the main issue given above, or outweighs the proposed conservatory's conflicts with the development plan.

### **Conclusion**

14. No material considerations have been advanced in this case to justify a decision other than in accordance with the development plan, with which, in terms of the above-cited policies the proposed conservatory would clearly conflict. Accordingly, for the reasons set out above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*G J Fort*

INSPECTOR