



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2024

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/D/24/3347235

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 Thompson against the decision of Wyre Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00530/FUL, dated 19 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2024.
 - The development proposed is roof-lift to create first floor bedrooms; front and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are: -
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the adjacent residents.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The property is an existing single storey dwelling in a primarily residential area. The property is located adjacent a side access road that leads to playing fields to the rear of the property, the presence of which allows views around the property. There is a common boundary with No18 South Strand, which is a two-storey property. South Strand is a mix of single and two storey properties, with no common design context. Some of the properties have been extended.
4. The proposal seeks to raise the height of the property to accommodate a second storey. In addition to this, it is proposed to add extensions to the front and rear of the property.
5. Since the previous refusal and appeal dismissal (APP/U2370/D/22/3312869) the appellant has sought to address the concerns raised by the Council in reducing the extensions in size and changing the roof to a "jerkinhead" design in an attempt to soften the overall appearance and reduce the reliance on the gables of the original development.
6. The appellant has also sought to address the position of the Council in considering the proposal to be assessed as a new dwelling. In this respect I

agree with the appellant in that it should be assessed as a series of extensions, rather than a new dwelling. I will assess this on the basis of extensions to a property, but the scope of the works is considerable and whilst I may not agree with them, I can understand the Council's concerns that the proposal is tantamount to a new dwelling.

7. The new scheme has reduced the overall size of the proposal from that previously refused, but it still remains the case that the cumulative amount of development is significant, and the works, if completed, would be a dominant addition to the streetscene. With its visible position on the corner of South Strand and the side access road, it would appear visually discordant, even with the reduction in overall height. The alteration to the roof profile has created another issue in that it does not assimilate well into the locality.
8. As such, on this matter, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the locality. Therefore, there is conflict with Policy CDMP3 of the Wyre Local Plan (2019) (the LP) which, amongst other matters, expects development to be of a high standard that responds positively to the character and context of an area. I also find conflict with the Extending Your Home, Supplementary Design Document (2007) (the SPD) which seeks to ensure developments complement the general character of an area.

Living conditions of adjacent residents

9. As stated previously No18 South Strand is a two-storey property previously extended. The proposal has been reduced in overall height from that previously refused as well as the projections of the front and rear extensions. I find the reductions in these key dimensions have mitigated against the harm caused by the previous proposal to the living conditions of the residents of No18 South Strand.
10. As such I do not find material harm in the respect of the harm to the living conditions of No18 South Strand from the extensions as proposed. However, whilst I have not found harm in this in this matter, that does not overcome the material harm caused to character and appearance of the locality by the overall design and dominance of the proposals.
11. In this matter, I do not find conflict with policy CDMP3 of the LP as it relates to respecting the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, nor the SPD which seeks to ensure developments do not have an overbearing and enclosing impact on neighbours.

Other Matters

12. The Appellant has provided evidence of other developments with similar roof designs, and the general relationships of nearby properties in in area. Whilst there is some variation in roof types and property relationships within the area, none share the same context as the proposal before me. I am not convinced that differing roof designs in the area justify the proposal before me and accordingly I give them limited weight.

Conclusion

13. The proposal does not accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this.
14. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR