



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18TH March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M2325/D/21/3289538

44 Laverton Road, Lytham St Annes FY8 1EN

- 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 Simon Maher against the decision of the Fylde Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0608/HHO dated 30/09/2021, was refused by notice dated 25/11/2021.
 - The development proposed is extension to roof space of dwelling to create second floor living accommodation including raising of eaves, and ridge height, hip-to-gable enlargements and construction of rear dormer including insertion of additional first floor window in west facing side elevation of original dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council altered the description of development, this is also the description used by the Appellant on the appeal form. I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposal and accordingly I have adopted an amended description in the heading above rather than the appellants description of development.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on (i) the character and appearance of the area; and (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, 45 and 47 The Boulevard.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The site is within a residential area characterised predominantly by detached and semi-detached properties. Whilst there are varying designs of properties in the immediate area there is a commonality of features such as hipped roofs and first floor windows directly beneath the eaves of the roof.
5. Raising the roof to form a gap between the top of the first floor windows and the eaves would disrupt the harmonious feature of the streetscene, this combined with the hip to gable change in roof design would result in an incongruous form of development.

6. The proposed development would be disproportionate to the host property and at would be out of keeping with the prevailing characteristics of the area.
7. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. There is conflict with Policy GD7 of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 (incorporating Partial Review) (the Local Plan) and Policy DH1 of the St Anne's on the Sea, Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016-2031 which seeks amongst other things to ensure developments are of a high standards of design which positively contribute to local distinctiveness and character.
8. There is also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.

Living Conditions

9. The proposed development includes a dormer window serving a staircase. There are existing windows at first floor facing the neighbouring properties to the rear, namely 45 and 47 The Boulevard. Whilst the proposed development would introduce a window at a higher level, mutual overlooking already exists. I note that the appellant proposes to provide obscure glazing to this window, this could be controlled by the imposition of a planning condition. The proposed development would not exacerbate the current arrangements in terms of overlooking.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, 45 and 47 The Boulevard. There is no conflict with Policy GD7 of the Local Plan which seeks amongst other things to ensure development does not adversely affect neighbouring properties.
11. There is also no conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure developments maintain a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusion

12. Whilst I have concluded that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring properties, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified in terms of the character and appearance of the area.
13. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR