



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2022

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A2335/D/22/3290474

22 Keats Avenue, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth, Lancashire LA5 8HH

- 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 Mrs Sciville against the decision of Lancaster City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01384/FUL, dated 9 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing porch and erection of a two storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing porch and erection of two storey front extension at 22 Keats Avenue, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth, Lancashire, LA5 8HH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01384/FUL, dated 9 November 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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: ref 21-023 drawing No 001 Elevation, Floor, Site and Location Plan.
 - 3) The material to be used in the construction of 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 area.

Reasons

3. No 22 is a 2 storey semi-detached property in a residential area. It forms part of a row of similar properties with dashed walls, brick detailing and feature cladding to front elevations. Properties are set back from the street behind open frontages. The opposite side of the road is characterised by single storey properties, some with dormer roof extensions. At a wider scale, the different styles and sizes of buildings, their varied siting and alignment and the change in ground levels results in a mixed townscape character and appearance.
4. The 2 storey front extension, roughly 1.7m deep and 2.4m wide, would replace the existing single storey red brick pitched roof porch extension. It would be

finished in painted render with windows and roof to match the existing. The proposal would have an eaves height to match No 22 but its gable pitched roof would be set down from the main ridge line. The relatively modest increase in built development at first floor level would be noticeable but, taking into account its modest size, the proposal would not be a discordant or ungainly feature. By virtue of its scale and design, the proposal would be a subservient feature that would not overwhelm the front elevation of its host.

5. The proposal would protrude forward from the front elevations of the pair of semi-detached properties, but only to a similar shallow depth as the single storey porch. No 24 has not been extended to the front such that the proposal would not mirror the adjoining property, but any perceived lack of balance would not harm the fundamental character and appearance of the pair of properties. As the proposal would not overwhelm the front elevation of its host, it would not overwhelm the pair of the properties.
6. The pairs of properties on this side of Keats Avenue are on stepped building lines. The evidence indicates that the proposal would be forward of the building line of the neighbouring properties to one side, but it would be behind the building line of the neighbouring properties on the other side. Therefore, the proposal would not protrude forward from, and it would not disrupt, a consistent or strong shared building line in the street.
7. There are no 2 storey front extensions along Keats Avenue, but there are various styles of single storey porch extension. Moreover, the visual context extends beyond the immediate group to include properties of various styles and sizes, differently sited and aligned and at varied ground levels. Therefore, notwithstanding the similar group of which No 22 forms part, in the absence of a high degree of visual uniformity to the surrounding townscape, the proposal would not appear incongruous or discordant in the area. It would not detract from local distinctiveness or diminish a strong sense of place.
8. My attention has been drawn to 2 storey front extensions elsewhere in the area, including on nearby Sunnybank Road and Shelley Close. I accept that those schemes do not provide a visual context for the proposal, but neither do they appear to provide a context for one another. Moreover, while I have considered the proposal on its own merits, the schemes and host properties at 44 and 72 Sunnybank Road in particular appear markedly similar, albeit that the proposal would be apparently less deep and with a lesser visual impact than the scheme at No 72. While they do not provide a justification for the proposal, the nearby schemes demonstrate that similar 2 storey front extensions in similar surrounding contexts, including staggered building lines, can be accommodated without detriment to visual amenity.
9. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the appeal property, the pair of semi-detached properties or the area. It would not conflict with the aims of Policy DM29 A Local Plan for Lancaster District 2011-2031 Part Two: Review of the Development Management DPD Adopted July 2020, in relation to contributing positively to identity and character through good design, having regard to local distinctiveness. It would not conflict with the design and visual amenity aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested planning conditions in the event the appeal was allowed. I have considered these against the relevant requirements of the Framework. In addition to the standard condition limiting the lifespan of the planning permission, I have specified the approved plans in the interests of certainty. A condition securing matching materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted, subject to conditions.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR