



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2022

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A2335/D/22/3307794

5 Hunters Gate, Lancaster, Lancashire, LA1 5BX

- 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 and Mrs Hammond against the decision of Lancaster City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00577/FUL, dated 10 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing car port to the side elevation, erection of a two storey side extension including installation of a balustrade and a first floor extension over garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing car port to the side elevation, erection of a two storey side extension including installation of a balustrade and a first floor extension over garage at 5 Hunters Gate, Lancaster, Lancashire, LA1 5BX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00577/FUL, dated 10 May 2022, 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: 1775.E.1 Rev B Location and Block Plans; 1775.P.3 Rev K Proposed Elevations; 1775.P.1 Rev G Proposed Ground Floor; 1775.P.2 Rev J Proposed First Floor Plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The development is described in the application form as the addition of a single storey workshop and first floor games room over the existing garage and proposed workshop. However, I have taken the description in the banner heading above from the decision notice and the appeal form in the interests of clarity as this better describes the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property.

Reasons

4. No 5 is a large 2 storey detached dwelling with an attached single storey garage and a car port. It is finished in red brick with a grey tile pitched roof. The dwelling appears broadly L-shaped with 2 storey gable ends and roof gables of various sizes and single storey bay windows and porch with pitched roofs. The garage is sited behind the property and it is connected to the dwelling by a single storey pitched roof utility room. No 5 forms part of a small group of properties in similar sizes and styles arranged around a cul-de-sac in a mature wooded setting.
5. The proposal would be a first floor extension above the garage with a smaller linking section above the utility room. The car port would be replaced by a single storey flat roof extension with a garage door. The larger extension roof would be below the height of the main roof, with rooflights and gable peaks to either side above first floor openings. The first floor gable end would be extensively glazed with opening doors and a glass balustrade. The narrow linking section would be set below the main extension ridge. The proposal would be finished in materials to match its host.
6. The extension would have a complicated design with roofs of different heights and pitches. However, the appeal property is complex with 2 storey and single storey parts, differing roof styles and pitches and variously sized gable peaks. In this context, and in contrast to the existing square hip garage roof, the 2 storey roof with gable peaks would be in keeping with and sympathetic to the main roof of No 5. Taking into account the design of the dwelling, even if the proposal was not sited behind the property, the stepped eaves heights and the shallower pitch of the extension roof would not be conspicuous or jarring.
7. It would be a substantial addition to the property, but the proposal would be subservient in height and scale to its host and it would not overwhelm it. Moreover, the siting and orientation of No 5 allows only oblique public views of the existing garage and car port. The first floor bulk of the extension would be similarly screened from views by the host property. The proposal would not be prominent nor visually obtrusive in the street scene. It would not be disproportionate or out of scale in the surrounding built or wooded landscape context. It would not detract from local distinctiveness or sense of place.
8. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the appeal property or the area. It would not conflict with Policy DM29 of A Local Plan for Lancaster District 2011-2031 Part Two: Review of the Development Management DPD Adopted July 2020 insofar as this requires development to contribute positively to local character and identity, having regard to matters including siting, orientation and scale. There would be no conflict with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in relation to development being sympathetic to the surrounding built environment and maintaining a strong sense of place.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested planning conditions in the event the appeal was allowed. I have considered these against the tests in 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 also necessary to protect the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area.

Conclusion

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

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR