



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/D/24/3354592

9 Rydal Avenue, Thornton Cleveleys, Lancashire FY5 4AJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr John Cummings against the decision of Wyre Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00713/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council changed the description of development from that stated on the application form in the interests of clarity. I consider that the amended description accurately describes the appeal scheme and accordingly I have adopted an amended description in the heading above.
3. Since the submission of the appeal the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework). However, in relation to this appeal the aims of both sets of policies are similar. No party would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal in light of this change in policy.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in this appeal are (i) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and (ii) whether the development provides adequate off-street parking.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The site is within a predominantly residential area characterised by predominantly traditional terraced and semi-detached two-storey properties, forming a harmonious built form. Notwithstanding this some properties in the area have been extended or altered.
6. The appeal property is a modest two storey property located on the corner of Rydal Avenue and Ullswater Avenue. The proposed development would extend the

property closer to Ullswater Avenue, beyond the building line with other properties fronting the road.

7. The mass of the proposed development would be substantial in scale and would not be subordinated to the host property. Overall, the scale of the proposed development on a corner plot along with the position in terms of building line would be incongruous to the area.
8. Whilst the appellant has suggested reducing the size and setting the extension back from the existing property, I have not been provided with any details of this. Notwithstanding this each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal before me.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. There is conflict with Policy CDMP3 of the Wyre Local Plan 2011-2031 (incorporating partial update of 2022) (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 also conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.
11. The proposed development conflicts with the Extending Your Home Supplementary Design Document (2007) which seeks to ensure developments complement the general character of an area.

Highway Safety

12. Appendix B of the Local Plan details car parking standards applicable for different development proposals. The proposed development increases the number of bedrooms from 3 to 4. The car parking standards highlight that a 2-3 bedroom house requires a maximum of 2 parking spaces per dwelling, whereas a 4 bedroom house requires 3 parking spaces.
13. The Council confirm that the existing garage to the rear of the property is too small in length to be classified as an off-street parking space. The area to the front is also constrained in terms of size. I have not been provided with substantive evidence to demonstrate that adequate off-street parking can be provided.
14. I conclude that the proposed development has failed to demonstrate that adequate off-street parking can be provided. There is conflict with Policy CDMP6 of the Local Plan which amongst other things seeks to ensure appropriate provision is made for vehicular access, off-street parking.

Conclusion

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

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR