



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 05 July 2024

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M2325/D/24/3343952

205 Clifton Drive South, Lytham St Annes, Lancashire FY8 1EY

- 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 Mrs Anne Pratt against the decision of Fylde Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0029.
 - The development proposed is described as a first floor extension to existing bungalow to create 2 storey dwelling, including single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - a) The living conditions of the occupiers of The Guardhouse with particular regard to overbearing and overshadowing, and No.203 Clifton Drive South (No.203) with particular regard to loss of outlook and light; and,
 - b) The character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

3. The Guardhouse is a single storey property which is located immediately to the rear of the appeal site. The appeal dwelling is located deep in its plot, and as such is positioned close to the boundary with The Guardhouse. The Guardhouse has a modest private garden to its rear. As existing the appeal dwelling has a modest eaves height and pyramidal roof design. Notwithstanding these design characteristics, the dwelling is prominent from the garden space of The Guardhouse and results in an existing sense of enclosure.
4. The proposed development would increase the eaves height of the dwelling. The height to eaves would be similar to the ridge height of The Guardhouse. The eaves height would project by some distance above the height of the boundary fence. Furthermore, the change in roof design would mean that there would be a greater mass of roofscape along much of the boundary. The increase in eaves height and a larger extent of roof, together with its close proximity, would result in a large mass of development that would be prominent on the site boundary. This would significantly exacerbate the sense of enclosure to the modest private garden space of The Guardhouse. Therefore,

I find that the scale, mass and proximity of the development to the garden would result in an unacceptable level of overbearing. Furthermore, the orientation of the properties is such that The Guardhouse is positioned roughly to the north of the appeal dwelling. Therefore, the increase in scale and mass on the boundary would likely result in a greater degree of overshadowing on the private garden space of The Guardhouse.

5. I acknowledge that the proposals would remove an existing rear flat roof projection. However, this is relatively small, subservient to the dwelling and is not positioned adjacent to the garden space. Therefore, it does not add significantly to the existing sense of enclosure. As such, its removal would not create a sense of openness to reduce the harmful effect of the development arising from the increase in mass and height.
6. No.203 is located to the side of the appeal site, and has an oriel window which projects out from its flank elevation. It is understood that this window is the sole window serving a habitable room. The two dwellings are closely spaced, separated by a side driveway to No.203 and narrow strip of garden space within the appeal site. The window has an existing outlook towards the roof of the dwelling. The roof slopes away from No.203 which would lessen its prominence in views from the window.
7. The extension would see a change of roof design from a pyramidal roof to a dual pitched roof. In addition, the first-floor extension would increase the eaves height of the dwelling. Together, this would add increased scale and mass to the side elevation. Consequently, the first floor window would have an outlook towards a two-storey gable at close distance. The positioning of the window, and proximity from the development, would mean that the full extent of the side gable would be dominant in the outlook from this window. This would create a greater sense of enclosure to the window, resulting in a poor outlook for the occupiers of No.203.
8. I note that the window projects from the elevation and has additional glazing to its sides. However, these additional glazed elements are small, and the main elements of glazing face towards the appeal dwelling. Therefore, I do not consider that the design of the window would reduce the poor outlook that would arise as a result of the development in this regard.
9. The position of the window, at first floor level, would mean that the shadow cast on the window from the additional mass is unlikely to be significant. The oriel design of the window also allows for greater infiltration of light into that room. Furthermore, the orientation of the properties would mean that any additional loss of light to the window would likely be limited to later parts of the day rather than for significant periods of time. Therefore, for these reasons and when considered together, I do not find that the extension would result in an unacceptable loss of light or overshadowing to the window.
10. For the above reasons, the proposed extension would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of The Guardhouse, with particular regard to overbearing and overshadowing. The proposed extension would also have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.203, with particular regard to loss of outlook. Therefore, the development conflicts with Policy GD7 of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 (incorporating Partial Review) (the LP), and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy

Framework (2023) (the Framework). Together, amongst other things, these seek to ensure that the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring uses are not adversely affected by development. The extension would also conflict with the general design principles set out in the Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document 2007 (the SPD), which seeks to protect living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Character and Appearance

11. No.205 Clifton Drive South is a detached bungalow which occupies a corner plot at the junction with Sandringham Road. The dwelling has a tall pyramidal roof, and gable projections to its front and side. The dwelling is sited deep within its plot with its main garden space located to the front behind well landscaped front and side boundaries. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character. Clifton Drive South includes dwellings which are varied in design, form and age. A recurring characteristic is contrasting front bay windows and gables. There is more uniformity along Sandringham Road, which also includes front facing gables, albeit there are elements of variety in their design. The dwellings on Sandringham Road are set back from the street and have a generally consistent building line.
12. A single storey projection is proposed to the side façade which would address Sandringham Road. This would be taller than existing and would have a greater depth. However, this would be no closer to Sandringham Road than existing. While the extension is forward of the Sandringham Road building line, the degree of projection would not be significant. The dwelling would remain set back from the highway which would ensure that the sense of spaciousness from the street is maintained.
13. The dwelling would be primarily viewed in the context of Clifton Drive South, which has a distinctly varied character that is different to Sandringham Road. The spacing of the dwelling from Sandringham Road would ensure that views along Sandringham Road would not be eroded. Furthermore, the existing landscaped boundaries would lessen the intervisibility of the dwelling with the streetscene beyond. Nonetheless, even if the landscaping were to be removed the side facing gable would be viewed against the backdrop of the various gables on Sandringham Road. Therefore, the dwelling would not appear prominent or out of context with the Sandringham Road frontage.
14. The significant variation of dwelling designs along Clifton Drive South ensures that there would be visual capacity to absorb further variation in the design of dwelling. Many dwellings have contrasting widths of bay windows and gables within their front elevation. As such, there is an absence of uniformity and general lack of symmetry to many of the front façades. The design of the extensions would include two projecting gables to the front façade which are largely glazed. This would be consistent with a recurring characteristic along the street, and would visually tie the dwelling into surrounding properties. I do not consider that the lack of symmetry or imbalance of glazing would result in a form of development that would be harmful to the streetscene.
15. For the above reasons, the proposed extension would not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the development complies with Policy GD7 of the LP, DH1 of the Saint Anne's on Sea Neighbourhood Development Plan (2016 to 2031), and guidance

contained within the Framework. Together, amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development delivers high quality design which is sympathetic to its surroundings. The development would also comply with the SPD which allows for extensions which are not harmful to the street scene.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR