
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2017

by Mark Dakeyne BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/D/16/3163554

147 Blackpool Old Road, Poulton-le-Fylde, Lancashire FY6 7RN

- 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 Julian Attwood against the decision of Wyre Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00510/FUL, dated 26 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a front dormer and front extension to create first floor and gable roof over, and insertion of a window in side of dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the front extension on the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Blackpool Old Road in the vicinity of the appeal site is fronted by a mix of dwelling types. There is a run of semi-detached houses with even spacing sitting slightly above the road on its southern side whereas to the north a row of bungalows, including the appeal property, line the highway. Nos. 133 to 149 are, with one exception, conventional bungalows with similar widths, heights and roofing materials and no modifications to their front roof slopes, albeit that the specific designs vary. The exception is No 141 which is significantly wider and has a gable and dormers in its front roof slope. No 151 is also a bungalow with a roof height comparable with those to the east but has a wider frontage.
 4. The predominantly even line of hipped and gabled tiled bungalow roofs seen on the approach from both the north-east and south-west and face on would be noticeably disrupted by the front extension into the roof slope. The ridge height of the gable would be the same as the existing and the extension would not come forward of the existing ground floor. But the eaves height would be well above that of the bungalow so that significant areas of the side walls of the extension would be seen alongside the roof slope. This characteristic, combined with the width of the extension and the amount of its projection forward to about the same plane as the front elevation, would result in an unduly bulky addition to the roof.
 5. The existing bungalow is plain in its appearance and the front elevation is not symmetrical due to the small shallow pitched roof projection to the right.
-

However, the bulky extension, when seen alongside the more modest gabled dormer to the left, would also lead to a significantly more imbalanced front elevation.

6. I acknowledge that the forward projecting gable and dormers of No 141 already leads to some disruption to the otherwise consistent run of roofs. However, that property can be distinguished from the appeal bungalow and others in the line due to the size of the plot and the spacing to its eastern side such that it is more able to absorb the alterations that have taken place recently than would the more modestly proportioned appeal property and other nearby bungalows. Moreover, the eaves height of the gable to No 141 does not exceed that of the remainder of the property and the roof is below the main ridge so it sits comfortably as part of the roofscape.
7. The semi-detached and detached houses to the east of No 133 are part of the wider street scene and have different eaves heights but, like the semi-detached properties opposite, do not form part of the more contained line of bungalows.
8. I conclude that the front extension would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area. There would be conflict with Policy SP14 and, by association, Policy H4 of the Wyre Borough Local Plan as the addition would not represent a high standard of design and would not be acceptable in the 'local landscape' due to its scale, style and siting.
9. The Supplementary Planning Document 'Extending Your Home' is a material consideration. That part of the guidance relating to 'Front Extensions' would not be followed as the addition would be intrusive in the street scene and would not be modestly sized and sympathetically proportioned with, and would harm the character of, the main building. The development would represent poor design which the National Planning Policy Framework says should be refused.
10. The modest proportions of the front dormer would not unduly disrupt the appearance of the dwelling or the street scene and the new side window to the stairwell could be obscure glazed. Therefore, I agree with the parties that neither of these elements would be objectionable. I also note that planning permission exists for two matching dormers to the front roof slope but these would be more in scale with the existing dwelling and its immediate neighbours than the front extension before me.
11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Mark Dakeyne

INSPECTOR