
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2020

by R Morgan MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/D/20/3253326

**18 Lynwood drive, Stalmine-with-Staynall, Poulton-le-Fylde, Lancashire
FY6 0PZ**

- 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 Liam Jenkinson against the decision of Wyre Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01030/FUL, dated 8 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension (over part of an existing garage), side dormer and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of development used in the Council's decision notice and appeal form which more succinctly describes the proposal than that on the application form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located at the end of a row of houses fronting onto Lynwood Drive. Whilst there is a variety of house types within the surrounding area, the appeal property is viewed in the context of its immediate neighbours on this side of Lynwood Drive, all of which have distinctive steeply pitched gables on their front elevations. Like other properties in the row, 18 Lynwood Drive (No 18) has a flat roofed porch and garage to the side, set well back from the front building line. The recessed siting and low height of the porches and garages reinforces the prominence of the steep gables, which strongly define the character of this side of the street.
5. Many of the properties in the row have been extended in some way, frequently with two storey side extensions. However, these extensions have been set well back from the front elevations so that the steep gables are retained as the dominant feature of the houses. In contrast, the proposed two storey side extension would be sited forward of the existing porch and garage, with a

- limited set back from the front gable. The steep gable would no longer be viewed in isolation, but instead as a part of a much larger building.
6. The extension would be more than half of the width of the existing front gable and its substantial size would appear out of scale and overly dominant in relation to the host dwelling. Although the roofline would slope away when viewed from the street, the long ridge would be almost the height of that of the existing gable roof. As a result of its significant height and width, combined with the limited set back, the proposed extension would not appear subservient to, nor would it complement, the host dwelling.
 7. The appeal property is the only truly detached house in the row and its side garden, adjacent to the corner, provides a gap in the built form, which contributes to a feeling of spaciousness. However, this gap would be filled to a considerable extent by the proposed development. Furthermore, on turning into the street, the proposed side elevation would appear as an overly large and bulky feature, the design of which, with four windows and a partial hip, would fail to respect the character of the houses along this side of the street.
 8. Overall, as a result of its size and design, the proposal would appear overly dominant in relation to the host dwelling and would form an incongruous and prominent feature in the street, which would cause harm to the character of the area.
 9. The appellant has drawn my attention to a similar extension which was granted planning permission at 1 Rosemount Avenue¹. However, it is clear from the planning officer's report relating to that case that the extension did not fully meet the Council's guidance, and was described as bulky and excessively large. It was permitted having regard to the particular circumstances of the case, including the planning history and surrounding context. Those circumstances are not the same as in the current appeal, and the permission at Rosemount Avenue does not provide a justification for allowing harmful development in this case.
 10. I note the appellant's comment that the existing house is not energy efficient, but there may be other ways of improving its energy rating without causing the harm to the host dwelling and wider area that I have identified.
 11. I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It conflicts with Policy CDMP3 of the Wyre Local Plan which requires development to be of a high standard of design that respects or enhances the character of the area. There is further conflict with the Extending your Home Supplementary Planning Document 2007, which in Design Note 1 explains that alterations or extensions should be designed to appear subordinate to the original dwelling and not visually dominate it. Conflict also exists with the requirements for high quality design contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

¹ Application reference 16/00833/FUL

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR