

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2022

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A2335/D/21/3289494
109 Crag Bank Road, Carnforth, LA5 9JB

- 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 Richard Sykes against the decision of Lancaster City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00807/FUL, dated 27 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is extension and alterations to existing detached garage and games room to form home gym, office and games room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Amended plans were submitted following submission of the planning application the subject of this appeal but prior to its determination. Amendments included a reduction in the overall height of the development proposed, as well as the removal of two front roof-lights.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling with a tall detached garage offset to the front. The garage is a large structure and has a single storey off-shoot to the rear, which is lower in height.
 5. It is located in residential area characterised by the presence of a range of dwelling types, including bungalows, two storey detached, semi-detached and terraced houses.
 6. The appeal property is located at the edge of the built-up area and lies adjacent to open countryside, close to a public footpath. There are a number of detached dwellings nearby to the appeal property and these are set back from the road, some behind large gardens.
 7. This set-back, along with the presence of hedgerows, trees, gardens and the immediacy of the countryside affords the area a notably green and spacious
-

character. The appeal property's tall garage is the closest building to the road in this area and as such, it appears prominently from various viewpoints. However, the distinctive square shape of the main garage, with its pyramidal roof – which matches that of the host dwelling – and the low height of the off-shoot to the rear, means that it does not appear unduly dominant.

8. Whilst together the garage and off-shoot cover a relatively large footprint and the garage's main roof extends to a significant height, the pyramidal shape of the roof allows for views around it to the greenery beyond, and the low height of the off-shoot means that only the relatively short length of the square main garage appears prominently from the main road. These features ensure that the garage appears ancillary to the host property.
9. The proposed development would result in significant increases to the height and volume of the garage. The square shape and pyramidal roof of the existing garage would be replaced by a long, tall structure, providing for accommodation at ground and first floor level.
10. I find that this would result in the creation of a building of such height and bulk that it would no longer appear subservient or ancillary to the host dwelling. Rather, its overall dimensions and design would afford it the scale and to some considerable degree, the general appearance of a detached dwelling, albeit "squeezed" close to the host property.
11. The harm arising from the above would be exacerbated as a result of the prominent siting of the proposed development adjacent to the road, above which it would tower, drawing the eye and dominating views.
12. In addition to the above, the design of the proposal is such that it would appear large and awkward when seen from the public domain. The proposed roof would not match the distinctive appearance of the pyramidal roof of the host property, but would introduce features, including a change in height and the "clipping" of the ends of the roof which would to some degree, lead it to jar with the appearance of the roof of the host property. This and the height and siting of the proposal would add to its visual intrusiveness.
13. Taking the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and to DPD¹ Policy DM29, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

¹ A Local Plan for Lancaster District 2011-2031. Part Two: Review of the Development Management DPD (2020).