



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/D/22/3312869

20 South Strand, Fleetwood, Lancashire FY7 8RL

- 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 Ms Bliss Thompson against the decision of Wyre Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00858/FUL dated 18 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is roof lift to create first floor living accommodation, extensions to front and rear and provision of solar panels to front roof slope
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council changed the description of development from that stated on the application form in the interests of clarity. I consider the amended the description accurately describes the appeal scheme and accordingly I have adopted the amended description in the heading above.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The site is within a predominantly residential area with properties of varying form and design. The proposed development seeks to alter a detached bungalow to create a two-storey property.
5. The appeal site is bounded on two sides by highway which I noted during my site visit that when travelling towards the site from the south-east the gap the highway creates allows a clear view of the property. The proposed development would increase the size of the property substantially. The alterations would result in a bulky gable wall with a shallow roof design, which due to the location of the plot would be a prominent and stark feature in the streetscene.

6. The Appellant has reduced the ridge height of the proposed development from that of a previously refused scheme. Nevertheless, the subsequent shallow pitch due to the bulky design of the proposed development would be a discordant feature in the streetscene. The roof would appear disproportionate to the scale of the extended property.
7. The Appellant has provided photographs showing shallow roof designs and higher ridge heights within the area. I observed during my site visit that roof designs on properties in the area do differ, nonetheless none are comparable to the proposal before me. I am not persuaded that differing roof design in the area would justify the proposal before me and I give them limited weight.
8. The proposed development would be a dominant addition to the area and would appear incongruous in the streetscene. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area.
9. There is conflict with Policy CDMP3 of the Wyre Local Plan 2011-2031 (2019) (the Local Plan) which seeks amongst other things to ensure development is of high standard of design responding positively to the character and context of an area.
10. There is conflict with the Extending Your Home, Supplementary Design Document (2007) (the SPD) which seeks to ensure developments complement the general character of an area.
11. There is conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which seeks amongst other things to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.

Living Conditions

12. No. 22 South Strand is a bungalow, similar in scale and design to the appeal site. Whilst the proposed development would be a discordant feature in the streetscene, due to the separation distance between the appeal site and No. 22 the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of occupiers of No. 22.
13. No. 18 South Strand is a large detached property which has been extended. The proposed development would have a similar ridge height to No. 18, although the proposed eaves would be higher. The existing bungalow appears to project marginally further than the large single storey extension at No. 18. Notwithstanding this due to the gable mass created, the proposed development would appear overbearing and dominant, particularly when viewed from the first and second floor rear elevation of No. 18 and the rear private amenity space associated with the property. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of occupiers of No. 18 South Strand.
14. There is conflict with Policy CDMP3 of the Local Plan which seeks amongst other things to ensure development respects the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties. There is also conflict with the SPD which seeks to ensure developments do not have an overbearing and enclosing impact on neighbours.
15. There is also conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure developments have high standards of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Issues

16. The Appellant has raised as an issue that they were unable to contact the Planning Officer to obtain their thoughts on the proposed development. Therefore, they were unable to amend the application. Whilst I understand the Appellant frustration the Council are under no obligation to engage with an Applicant once an application is being consideration.

Conclusion

17. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR