



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2023

by M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A2335/D/23/3315634

8 Church Bank, Over Kellet, Lancashire LA6 1DT

- 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 S Thrall against the decision of Lancaster City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01008/FUL, dated 2 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension and rear single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part single, part two storey rear/side extension at 8 Church Bank, Over Kellet, Lancashire LA6 1DT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/01008/FUL, dated 2 August 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing 1790.P.1 'Proposed location, block and roof plans';

Drawing 1790.P.2 'Proposed floor plans'; and

Drawing 1790.P.3 'Proposed elevations'.
 - 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 dwellinghouse.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development is set out in the banner heading above, however, the development also includes a proposed two-storey projection at the rear. The appeal form and the decision notice describe the proposal as 'erection of a part single, part two storey rear/side extension.' The Council determined the application on this basis, and so shall I.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on Church Bank, which consists of a circular road around a large, grassed, recreational area. Surrounding this is a mixture of semi-detached, two-storey dwellings, including No 8 Church Bank, and some bungalows. No 8 is attached to No 7, but it is also linked by a single storey garage to No 9. It is on the site of the garage where it is proposed to create the two-storey extension, with a single storey extension to the rear.
5. The proposal would match the materials of the host property, and at the front the extension would be set below the ridgeline of the house and extend no further forward than the existing garage. Whilst the first-floor rear projection has not been reduced in size by the amount requested by the Council, it would be lower in height than the two-storey extension at the front and would not appear overly large. Therefore, the proposal would be of an appropriate design and would appear subservient to the host property.
6. No 8 is clearly visible when entering Church Bank from Nether Kellet Road. However, as the proposal would be to the side, and set well back from the front elevation, it would not appear overly dominant in the streetscene.
7. Whilst the proposal would fill part of the existing gap that is visible above the garages of Nos 8 and 9, this is already filled by the backdrop of housing along Greenways to the rear. This contrasts with other parts of Church Bank where I saw that the gaps between pairs of houses were filled with open views of trees.
8. Although it has been suggested that the proposal would set a precedent for similar future development, two storey side extensions have already been permitted, as I saw at Nos 15, 23 and 24 Church Bank. This has largely retained the uniformity of design that would have existed when Church Bank was originally constructed and has not undermined the overall character and appearance of the area. Whilst I note that the Council's Householder Design Guide seeks to avoid a terracing effect, this proposal would not result in this, and any future applications along Church Bank would be assessed on their own merits.
9. In conclusion, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with Policy DM29 of the Lancaster District Local Plan 2011-2031, Part Two: Review of the Development Management DPD, July 2020, and chapter 12 of the Framework, which combined require development to contribute positively to the identity and character of an area through good design and appropriate siting.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard implementation condition, a condition listing the plans is necessary to provide certainty over what has been approved. Furthermore, to ensure the satisfactory appearance and form of development, a condition ensuring that the materials match the existing house is necessary.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, considering the development plan as a whole and all relevant material considerations, the appeal is allowed.

M J Francis

INSPECTOR