



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2022

by R Morgan BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M2325/D/21/3282606

5 Whitehead Close, Staining, BLACKPOOL, FY3 0DZ

- 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 Michael Bromwell against the decision of Fylde Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0372, dated 9 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the Council made its decision, it has adopted the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 (incorporating Partial Review). As a result, some of the policies contained in the original version of the Local Plan, which was adopted in 2018, have been superseded. One such policy is GD7: Achieving Good Design in Development, which was referred to in the Council's decision notice. The Partial Review contains a revised version of Policy GD7, but the changes are limited in extent, and the requirement for development to be of a high standard of design, taking account of the character and appearance of the local area, remains unaltered.
3. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has also been published since the Council's decision. I am satisfied that the changes to both Policy GD7 and the Framework do not materially affect the issues raised in this appeal, nor do they prejudice the cases made by either party.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. Elizabeth Close is a suburban street of modern detached dwellings, set back from the curved road behind front gardens. The spacing of the houses, together with the hedges and shrubs which have been planted along the frontages, contribute to a green and spacious character to the street.
6. The appeal property fronts onto Whitehead Close, but its front, side and rear gardens form a long boundary along Elizabeth Close, near to the junction with

The Nook. The proposed side extension, which would provide a garage, would fill the majority of the garden to the side of the house. There is a slight curve in the road where it runs along the boundary of the appeal site, but at its closest point, the extension would be very near to the back of the pavement.

7. The proposed extension would be of an acceptable design in relation to the main house, with materials to match those existing. However, the proposed garage would form a large expanse of solid built form along a prominent section of Elizabeth Close. Owing to its length and siting, the extension would fail to reflect the character of the street, in which built development, including outbuildings associated with the properties opposite, are set back from the street and softened by planting.
8. Despite the appellant's assurances that the existing coniferous boundary hedge would be retained, thereby concealing the proposed extension, it is clear from the submitted plans, and from visiting the site, that it would be necessary to remove a section of the hedge and fence to accommodate the extension. The proposed garage would therefore be clearly visible, and would form an overly dominant feature within the streetscene.
9. I conclude that the proposed extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy GD7 of the Local Plan to 2032 (incorporating Partial Review), which amongst other considerations requires that the siting, layout and massing of the proposed development relate well to the surrounding context.
10. Furthermore, the proposal would not comply with the detailed requirements for side extensions contained in the 'Extending your Home' Supplementary Planning Guidance note, which highlights the importance of side gardens to the character of the streetscene. Conflict would also exist with paragraph 130 of the Framework, which requires new development to be sympathetic to local character.
11. A single storey side extension of the form proposed may, in other circumstances, benefit from permitted development rights, but in this case planning permission is required and therefore it is necessary to assess the proposal in accordance with relevant planning policies.

Conclusion

12. The proposed extension would conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR