



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2022

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/D/21/3287022
82 Lancaster Road, Garstang, PR3 1JB

- 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 and Mrs Doyle against the decision of Wyre Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00556/FUL, dated 27 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a one and a half storey front, rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a one and a half storey front, rear and side extension at 82 Lancaster Road, Garstang, PR3 1JB in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/00556/FUL, dated 27 April 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan GA3289-LP-01; Existing Site Plan GA3289-ESP-01; Existing Floor Plans and Elevations GA3289-001; Proposed Site Plan GA3289-PSP-01; and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations GA3289-002F.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a relatively small semi-detached single-storey bungalow with a gabled projection at the front. It is situated in a residential area and faces Lancaster Road. The bungalow is one of a row of similar semi-detached bungalows, but other dwellings along Lancaster Road include two-storey houses and dormer-bungalows.
4. The proposal, which is a resubmission following a previous refusal for an extension (20/00764/FUL), is to construct a one and a half storey front, rear and side extension. It would include rooms at first-floor level and, as a result,

it would be taller than the existing roof of the bungalow. It would also extend beyond the existing rear wall of the property by just over 4m.

5. Policy CDMP3 of the adopted Wyre Local Plan (LP) requires development to respect or enhance the character of the area, with particular regard to scale, mass and height. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Extending Your Home 2007 (SPD) also advises (amongst other things) that extensions should be subordinate to the original dwelling and that over-large extensions can have a harmful effect on the appearance of the property and the character of the surrounding area. The Council contends that the proposed extension would conflict with Policy CDMP3, because it would be over dominant as a result of its height, bulk and mass.
6. There is no doubt that the proposed extension would be a significant addition to the existing bungalow and that it would be a prominent feature in the streetscene, because of its height and mass. The extended property would also appear different to the adjoining semi and the other bungalows in the row. Consequently, there would be some conflict with Policy CDMP3 of the LP. It is a statutory requirement that planning applications be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
7. A material consideration that has been brought to my attention, by the appellant, is the presence of two existing nearby extensions at numbers 3 and 11 Manor Road. Having viewed these during my site visit, I agree that, whilst there are some differences, these extensions are comparable to the appeal proposal in terms of their position in the streetscene and their scale and general design. In my opinion, these extensions have not had a harmful effect on the streetscene or on the appearance of the host and neighbouring properties. I acknowledge that these two extensions were granted permission prior to the publication of the Council's current SPD, but nevertheless, I consider the test is whether the appeal proposal would be unacceptably harmful, despite any conflict. In my opinion, the evidence on the ground is that this would not be the case.
8. Accordingly, I consider that any conflict with Policy CDMP3 is outweighed by the material considerations that I have referred to above.
9. In reaching my decision, I have noted that objections to the proposal from local residents were received by the Council. The Council considered these comments when determining the planning application and concluded that the proposal would not be detrimental to neighbouring properties. I have no reason to disagree with the Council on this issue.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. I have included these in my decision. In addition to the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and the list of approved plans, a condition is also imposed requiring the use of matching external materials. This is necessary to ensure a satisfactory external appearance.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be allowed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR