
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2017

by Stephen Normington BSc DipTP MRICS MRTPI FIQ FIHE

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

Decision date: 9 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/D/16/3162179

14 Bolton Avenue, Poulton-le-Fylde FY6 7TW

- 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 S Mattinson against the decision of Wyre Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00547/FUL, dated 13 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension, two storey side extension, rear dormer and front porch (re-submission of 16/00377/FUL).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a relatively modest sized semi-detached dwelling located on a prominent corner plot. A wide, spacious public footpath is located immediately to the west of the plot boundary leading to an area of open space to the rear of the property. Bolton Avenue is an estate of relatively modern detached and semi-detached dwellings, some of which have been extended but overall the extended dwellings remain proportionate to their plot size.
 4. The proposed development would involve the construction of a two storey side extension having a front façade that would be commensurate with that of the existing property and a pitched roof with the same ridge height as existing; a rear single storey extension that would be approximately 3.5 m deep and extend almost the full width of the extended property; a rear dormer that would be set in from the sides of the extended roof by approximately 0.85m and set back approximately 0.5 from the eaves; a three tier parapet wall of the western boundary of the property with the footpath and a front porch.
 5. In order to provide guidance to achieve the acceptable design and appearance of residential extensions, the Council has adopted a Supplementary Planning Document – Extending your home. This requires that the bulk and scale of the extension should appear subordinate to the original property, should not change the general character of the area and should not form an overly
-

- dominant feature in the street or as seen from neighbouring homes or garden areas.
6. The proposed extensions would be considerable additions to the property which I consider would unacceptably unbalance the appearance of this pair of semi-detached properties within the street scene. The side extension, in not being set in from the front façade or set down from the eaves, would appear as an overly dominant addition to the property in views from Bolton Avenue.
 7. The proposed rear dormer, although set in from the sides, would occupy the majority of the extended rear roof slope and as such would dominate the appearance of the roof of the property. Cumulatively, with the scale and mass of the rear single storey extension, the proposed rear extended elements would appear as dominant and incongruous additions to the property, particularly in views from the open space and footpath. Similarly, these elements would also unacceptably unbalance the appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties.
 8. The extended gable of the property and the proposed parapet wall would represent a considerable blank mass of walling positioned adjacent to the footpath. I agree with the Council that these features would unacceptably introduce a sense of enclosure on this part of the footpath by the introduction of a prominent and stark mass of brickwork that would erode the sense of spaciousness that currently exists along this part of the route of the path leading to and from the openspace.
 9. I also agree with the Council that the proposed front porch, whilst a modest addition to the property, would cumulatively contribute to the excessive mass and bulk of the combined extended elements.
 10. Whilst I observed that the adjacent property at No 16 has a first floor rear extension, and that there are examples of rear dormers in the vicinity, the proposed extensions would be of a scale and mass that are like no others on this part of the street. Given the prominence of the site, they would appear as overly dominant development that would harm the appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings and appear at odds with the scale and mass of development in the locality.
 11. Taking the above factors into account the proposed development would represent disproportionate and incongruous additions to property that would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, it would be contrary to Saved Policies SP14 and H4 of the Wyre Borough Local Plan (1999). These policies, amongst other things, require that residential extensions should be of a high standard of design that is acceptable in terms of scale, mass and style and should be compatible with adjacent existing land uses.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons and taking all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stephen Normington

INSPECTOR