
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2017

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/D/16/3166222
8 Mill Close, Inskip, Preston PR4 0TW

- 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 Ms. S Mr. S Watson-Cooper & Haley against the decision of Wyre Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00746/FUL, dated 23 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey front porch extension following removal of existing entrance canopy and support walls.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front porch extension at 8 Mill Close, Inskip, Preston PR4 0TW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/00746/FUL, dated 23 August 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: site location plan, site plan, 16-1003-P1, 16-1003-P2 and 16-1003-P3.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the roof and brick base courses of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building. The walls of the porch shall be rendered as detailed in the application.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development used in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However in allowing the appeal I have amended the description to delete reference to the removal of the existing entrance canopy and support walls as this is not an act of development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
-

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a modern semi-detached dwelling positioned in a slightly set back position towards the end of a small cul-de-sac of dwellings largely of a similar design and appearance. The modern dwellings including the host building are constructed from brick and all have small open canopy front porch features of an identical design with the exception of 4 Mill Close opposite the appeal site which has a larger, brick built front porch. A more traditional rendered dwelling is located at the entrance to the cul-de-sac with modern dwellings also incorporating rendered elements located in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site.
5. The proposed porch would be larger and of a different design to the existing open porches within the cul-de-sac. In particular it would be of a reduced height and roof pitch, have a different door design incorporating glazed side panels, be rendered and would not include a wooden slat design above the front door. However whilst the proposed porch would not mimic the design and appearance of the existing open canopy porch features or the porch at No 4, given its relatively limited scale it would be a subservient feature to the host building. Though none of the modern dwellings within the cul-de-sac incorporate render in their front elevations, as stated, render is in evidence in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. Consequently having regard to the limited scale of the proposed porch, the setback position of the appeal site and the use of render in the locality, I consider that whilst it would lead to some loss of uniformity within the cul-de-sac, the porch would not be a harmful feature within the streetscene.
6. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would not have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It therefore complies with policies SP14 and H4 of the Wyre Borough Local Plan insofar as they relate to character and appearance and with guidance contained within the Council's Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document 2007. These policies and guidance seek, amongst other things, high standards of design and development that is acceptable in the local landscape. Though not specifically referred to in the Council's reason for refusal, the proposal also complies with relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

7. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have not imposed the suggested condition requiring the materials to match those used in the existing building as this is not what was applied for and for the reasons stated above I consider that the use of render is acceptable. Instead I have imposed a condition stating that the roof materials and brickwork should match the existing and that the render should be as detailed in the application.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR