



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 December 2022

by M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A2335/W/22/3305861

Flat 3, 25 Cavendish Road, Heysham, Morecambe LA3 1TX

- 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 Martin Clerici against the decision of Lancaster City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00713/FUL, dated 9 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as "a roof extension of flat 3 to contain a new bedroom and bathroom".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form does not describe the development as being at the rear. It is clear however, from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises "erection of a second-floor rear extension". The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. No 25 Cavendish Road is a mid-terraced house within a short row of similar style properties, located in a residential area. The stone-faced terrace has a robust appearance, with stone bay windows, original attic windows and decorative features to the front. The rear, where the proposal is sited, is of brick construction with an original two storey rear projection, built under a projecting catslide roof. Attached to this is a two storey, pitched roof extension, built as a pair with the adjacent property, which in this case is No 27.
5. The house has an existing second floor, which is referred to as flat 3. This has a front attic window and is lit at the rear by two rooflights. The proposal seeks to create an extension to this floor at the rear. This would have a flat roof extending from the rear roofscape and would be located above the existing rear projections.
6. The rear roofscape of this terraced row has only one dormer extension, which appears as a small and discrete addition within the roof slope. Whilst there are

some differences in external finishes and window design, there is a general uniformity and a rhythm to the rear of the terrace.

7. The proposal would introduce a large, bulky, flat-roofed extension which would extend from the roofline to the full depth of the existing rear projection. Extending from the eaves line on a traditional roof form would create a discordant addition. Despite the proposal being below the overall ridge height of the roof, it would be higher than the apex of the pitched roof extension, paired with No 27. This would add to the incongruous nature of the design in this location.
8. The site is located to the rear of a supermarket and its car park, plus the adjoining Heysham Road, the A589. The proposal would, for that reason, not only be seen from the back lane, but from much wider views. The position of the extension on the roof and its unsympathetic form would therefore make it highly visible.
9. There are a number of other large rear extensions in the vicinity, including at Stanley Road and Sandylands Promenade. However, the terrace within which the appeal site is located retains a more restrained form without significant bulky additions. It is seen as a separate entity that makes a positive contribution to the townscape. As I have found the proposed addition to be prominent and incongruous with the host dwelling, this would harm the terrace and the contribution that it makes to the townscape.
10. In conclusion, the position and design of the extension would seriously harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Therefore, the proposal would not accord with Policy DM29 of the Lancaster District Local Plan 2011-2031, Part Two: Review of the Development Management DPD, July 2020 which requires development to contribute positively to the identity and character of the area through good design.

Other Matters

11. I saw that the current space within flat 3 is limited, and that an extension would create additional living accommodation. Whilst the proposal seeks to provide a high-quality extension, it would only improve the accommodation within one flat, resulting in a small benefit that would receive limited weight.

Conclusion

12. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

M J Francis

INSPECTOR