



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 March 2022

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A2335/D/22/3292696

2 Lane Cottages, Burrow Heights Lane, Lancaster LA2 0PG

- 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 Leon Wanless against the decision of Lancaster City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00717/FUL, dated 8 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property consists of one half of a pair of semi-detached stone-built, slate roofed properties situated in a small hamlet surrounded by open countryside. The property has previously been altered and extended, in particular by a what the appellant describes as a "modern contemporary single storey side and rear extension". At the site visit I also saw a wooden clad two storey rear extension, also of a contemporary appearance.
4. Policies DM29 and DM46 of the Development Management DPD, amongst other matters, seeks that new development contribute positively to local distinctiveness, with appropriate siting, scale and massing. The Council has also made reference to section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the requirement that development be of a high standard of amenity and design.
5. The Council describes the proposed extension as being "positioned above the existing single storey side/rear extension" and the submitted plans show that the extension would be clad in larch and with a slate roof. I saw at the site visit that the existing extensions to the side and rear of the property are already significant additions to the property.
6. The appeal property sits within a secluded location, the topography of the surrounding landscape screens much of the ground floor of the property from wider view to the side and rear. I saw at the site visit that the front and upper sections of the property are nonetheless visible from the road and a wider area.

7. The submitted plans show that the size and scale of the appeal scheme would result in an extension that is in itself, and in combination with existing extensions, of a significant scale and size wholly out of proportion to the host dwelling.
8. As a result, the proposed extension would appear as a prominent and incongruous addition to the appeal property and thus the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and the local area contrary to Policies DM29 and DM46 of the Development Management DPD and the provisions of section 12 of the Framework.

Other Matters

9. I note that the appellant has designed the extension to be of a similar appearance to the existing rear extension and that the design is generally in keeping with the recently constructed contemporary dwellings constructed in the hamlet. Nonetheless the size and scale of the appeal remains considerable and these design considerations do not mitigate the harm I have identified previously.
10. Furthermore, the appellant has drawn my attention to the prospect of further change in the area, specifically that land in the local area has been allocated for significant further development in the recently adopted Land Allocations Local Plan Document. I have not been provided all the details of this allocation nonetheless this is a material consideration that I give some weight to, it does not however outweigh the harm I have identified previously.
11. The appellant's supporting statement details that the appeal scheme is needed to increase the size and quality of the accommodation at the appeal property to facilitate working from home, the privacy of their children in their bedrooms and create guest accommodation. These benefits are primarily a private benefit to the appellants and do not outweigh the harm I have identified previously.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr M Brooker

INSPECTOR