



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2018

by Felicity Thompson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th October 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/D/18/3204210

31 Broadway, Fleetwood, FY7 7DQ

- 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 Graham Birch against the decision of Wyre Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/00244/FUL, dated 8 March 2018, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2018.
 - The development proposed is described as 'To extend the existing small kitchen area to create much need additional living space and accommodation'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the appeal was submitted the Government has published a new National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In relation to the main issue in this appeal there is no material difference between the policies of the old and the new Frameworks. As such, the cases for both main parties have not been prejudiced by the new Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached house located on a corner plot in a prominent roadside position in an attractive suburban area. The appeal property and those in the immediate vicinity and along Cambridge Road are constructed from red brick and incorporate large bay windows and follow discernible building lines set back from the road. The layout and appearance of the properties in the immediate area provides a rhythm and harmony to the streetscene, with views along Cambridge Road from Broadway being largely unobstructed.
5. The proposed extension would be constructed to the side of the house and would project from the side by about 3.3m with a height to ridge of about 4m. Whilst the materials used would match those of the existing house, because of its height and siting towards the public highway, the proposed extension would appear as a dominant addition in views from Cambridge Road. The projection

forward of the established building line would be emphasised in views towards the rear and further along Cambridge Road and as a result the extension would cause harm to the pattern of development and represent a discordant feature within the overall streetscene.

6. At my site visit I noted the fence panels had been removed. Even if they were to be replaced, whilst the lower walls of the extension would not be visible the upper part of the extension would and therefore the fence would not overcome the harm identified in respect of the dominant appearance and siting.
7. Consequently I conclude that the proposed extension would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area contrary to saved policies H4 and SP14 of the Wyre Borough Local Plan which together require high standards of design which are sympathetic to the qualities and character of the local area. It would also conflict with the design aims of the Framework.
8. The appellant has referred to and provided details of a planning permission for a single storey side and rear extension at a house on Southwood Avenue, at the junction with Cambridge Road. I saw that this extension is larger than the proposal before me but is not viewed in the same streetscene as the appeal property. I do not know the circumstances of this development being permitted and in any event I have considered the appeal scheme on its own merits. The existence of this extension does not justify the erosion of the character and appearance of the streetscene that would arise from the appeal proposal.

Other matters

9. I note that the Council found that the proposal would not cause any harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. However, this is a neutral matter which cannot therefore outweigh my earlier findings.
10. The misgivings expressed by the appellant about the way the Council dealt with this application are separate from the planning merits of the proposed development and they have no bearing on the outcome of this appeal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above the appeal is dismissed.

Felicity Thompson

INSPECTOR