



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: 13th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M2325/D/24/3357171

45 East Beach, Lytham St Annes, Lancashire FY8 5EY

- 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 C Jackson against the decision of Fylde Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0490.
 - The development proposed is alteration to existing second-floor front-facing recessed balcony to include the provision of a front-facing dormer with access to balcony with glazed balustrade.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the submission of the appeal the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework).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 Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing property and the area in general.

Reasons

4. The site is an upper floor flat within a semi-detached building in a row of predominantly residential buildings facing East Beach and Lytham Green. Properties in the area vary in terms of design, notwithstanding this I observed during my site visit that semi-detached properties tend to share common features providing a symmetrical pattern of development.
5. Some similar properties in the area have been extended or altered. The adjacent semi-detached properties which include No's. 43 and 44 East Beach have been substantially altered to incorporate contemporary features including alterations to the roof to provide a similar form of development to the appeal proposal before me.
6. The adjacent semi-detached properties form part of the character and appearance of the area, and whilst not symmetrical they have similar roof additions which does not detract from rhythm of built form in the area.

Similarly, the appeal site and its adjoining neighbour share similar roof designs, whilst not symmetrical they complement each other and are consistent with the appearance of the streetscene.

7. The proposed development would create a bulky top-heavy feature which would be an unsympathetic addition unbalancing the semi-detached properties creating an incongruous form of development.
8. I find that the development harms the character and appearance of the existing property and the area in general.
9. There is conflict with Policy GD7 of the Flyde Local Plan to 2032 (incorporating Partial Review) (2021) which seeks amongst other things for developments to be of a high standard of design and to relate well to the surrounding context. There is also conflict with the Framework which seeks amongst other things to ensure good design of developments.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has highlighted that the proposed development would create more space within the flat and that the works are required due to the roof structure requiring repairs and for safety reasons. I have not been provided with substantive evidence to demonstrate that the proposed development would be the only way to fulfil this need, I therefore give this limited weight.
11. The appellant has also confirmed that the works would increase the value of the property, whilst this maybe the case this is not a material planning consideration.

Conclusion

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

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR