



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2025

by **S Brook BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M2325/D/25/3359303

Moons Farm, 169 Staining Road, Staining, Lancashire FY3 0AZ

- 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 Grant Anderson against the decision of Fylde Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 24/0506.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Demolition of existing attached garage and construction of 2 storey domestic extension, plus reconstruction/relocation of existing porch with associated alterations'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and extensions to dwelling including: 1) Demolition of existing attached garage and construction of two storey and first floor rear extensions; and 2) Demolition of existing front porch and erection of replacement front porch, at Moons Farm, 169 Staining Road, Staining, Lancashire, FY3 0AZ, in accordance with the terms of the application reference 24/0506, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plans: 24012-001-P.01 Location and Site Plans, , 24012-001-P.05 Proposed Plans, 24012-001-P.06 Proposed Roof Plan, 24012-001-P.07 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 building.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the decision section above, I have used the description of development from the appeal form as this more accurately describes the development shown on the plans.
3. The appeal was made following the changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in December 2024. Both parties have had an opportunity to comment on the revised Framework and so have not been prejudiced by this change. I have thus had regard to the latest version of the Framework in determining this appeal.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:

- Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to any relevant development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework),
- The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building and the area, and
- If the development is inappropriate, whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development

5. The appeal site lies within designated Green Belt. Policy GD2 of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 (incorporating Partial Review), December 2021, (LP), states that within areas defined as Green Belt, national policy for development in the Green Belt will be applied. The Framework identifies that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. It goes on to state that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The Framework further establishes that development in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate, subject to a number of exceptions.
6. One such exception is the extension or alteration of a building, provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Neither LP policy GD2, nor the Council's Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document, November 2007, (SPD), provides further context to what may or may not be considered disproportionate.
7. Reference is made to LP policy H7 relating to extensions and alterations to dwellings located within the countryside, which includes a limit of 33% increase in ground floor area. While stating that this policy does not apply to dwellings in the Green Belt, the Council considers that the threshold in policy H7 represents an appropriate benchmark to gauge when the size of an extension in quantitative terms, will be proportionate.
8. The supporting text for this policy does reference proportionate extensions to dwellings in the countryside, albeit this is in response to the loss of small rural traditional homes and the resulting effect on affordability, as well as the impact of larger homes on the rural landscape, which are not relevant considerations in terms of Green Belt policy. As such, I have some reservations as to any reliance on this policy, even as a benchmark. Nevertheless, the appellant indicates that the proposal would be within the 33% footprint increase limit, in any event.

9. The appeal scheme relates to a detached, two-storey dwelling which includes a small porch to the front, and projections to the rear, including an attached garage. The proposal would include demolition of the attached garage, a repositioned porch of increased size to the south elevation, a first-floor extension with catslide roof over an existing single storey projection, and a two-storey extension, both to the north elevation. The main parties agree that this would amount to a 38% increase in volume over the existing dwelling.
10. The Council raises no concerns with the proposed porch and first-floor rear extension. These would be modest additions to the property and so would not appear disproportionate in size to the original building. As such, I have no reason to disagree with the Council in this respect.
11. The proposed two-storey extension would be large, extending approximately 6.5m to the rear. It would involve a change to the form of the dwelling, introducing a notable two storey projection at the rear, where presently, projections are modestly sized and are either single storey only, or sit below eaves height. As such, the proposal would introduce a larger scale of development to the rear of the dwelling.
12. Nevertheless, the ridge of the two-storey extension would sit below the ridge line of the main part of the dwelling and the projection of approximately 6.5m would be less than half the width of the existing dwelling. The width of the rear projection would be similar to the depth of the existing house and as a result, the gable end of the rear projection would be of similar proportions to the side gables of the existing dwelling, albeit somewhat lower in height. In combination, these factors would ensure that the proposed two storey extension would be scaled proportionately in relation to the existing dwelling.
13. When viewed from the north, the proposed two storey extension would be seen in context with the existing dwelling. In closer views from the west, the extension would be partially screened by existing trees and plants in the garden of the host property. While there would be a modest impact on the spatial aspect of openness, the proposal would not impact significantly on the visual aspect of openness.
14. As the proposal overall would be scaled proportionately in relation to the existing dwelling, the appeal scheme would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building and so, the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
15. While I have been provided with comments relating to the Framework's recent changes, including references to grey belt, as I have found that the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to exception c) of paragraph 154, and so it is not necessary for me to go and consider the exception provided by paragraph 155.

Character and Appearance

16. The host dwelling has a simple rectangular footprint, with rendered walls, painted quoins and a slate roof with two brick chimneys. It has a consistent window pattern to its front elevation, with a more mixed arrangement to the rear. It is set back from Staining Road, and partially screened by other buildings. While it is of some age, it has not been identified as a non-designated heritage asset, and from the information before me, I have no reason to consider it as such. A barn conversion is located to the south, while a row of terraced and semi-detached houses of

mixed age, style and materials, extend to the opposite side of the road. Open fields are located to the north, south and east.

17. The Council's second refusal reason raises concerns only with the two-storey rear extension. No concerns are raised in relation to the proposed porch or first floor extension. Having considered the proposed plans for the porch and first floor extension, I have no reason to disagree with the Council.
18. For the reasons set out above, I have concluded that the proposed two storey extension would not be disproportionate in scale to the existing dwelling. The two-storey projection would be positioned to the rear of the property. It would be set down from the ridgeline of the existing dwelling and it would extend across only a portion of this rear elevation. Consequently, it would appear suitably subordinate to the host dwelling.
19. The proposed two-storey extension would alter the shape of the dwelling, from its simple overall rectangular form to a 'T' shape. However, the rectangular form of the original part of the dwelling would remain legible. As the two-storey extension would be centrally positioned to the rear elevation, and given my conclusions on its proportions, the resulting overall form would not appear unbalanced. This part of the proposal would interrupt the staggered eaves line of the existing dwelling, but the resulting design would be equally acceptable.
20. In views along Staining Road, the bulk of the two-storey extension would be partially screened by the proposed catslide roof. From the west, views would also be filtered by trees. Consequently, the proposal would not appear unduly prominent in these public views.
21. While the elongated windows to the north elevation of the proposed two storey extension would differ in size and shape to others across the property, there is already a mix of window sizes and styles to this northern elevation and so this would not be particularly out of character for the property, or the area, which contains a mix of residential styles.
22. Consequently, I find that the proposal would not have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the building itself, or the area. The proposal would be acceptable with regards to the requirements of LP policy GD7, which seeks a high standard of design, by ensuring that matters such as layout, massing, scale, design, materials, architectural character, and proportions of a proposed development, relate well to the surrounding context, as well as advice contained within the Council's SPD.
23. As I have found that the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and so there would be no harm by reason of inappropriateness, and I have not identified any other harm, it is not necessary for me to go on and reach a finding as to whether other considerations amount to the very special circumstances, in order to justify the proposal.

Other Matters

24. To the east of the appeal site, beyond open fields, is the Grade II listed Staining Windmill. The setting of this listed building comprises predominantly of open fields, with pockets of woodland, along with residential development. Residential development is positioned both in its immediate vicinity and the wider area.

25. The host dwelling is an established part of the setting of this listed building and the proposed extensions to it, would not alter the setting in any notable or significant way. The windmill and its setting can be appreciated in views along Staining Road for a considerable length to the north and south of the appeal site. The proposed extension would interfere with the view of the windmill for only a very short stretch of Staining Road, at a point where the existing dwelling interferes with these views already. The proposal would not prevent an appreciation of the windmill in its setting from along Staining Road. Its setting would be preserved.
26. I acknowledge that the proposal may restrict private views of the windmill for some residents on Staining Road. However, occupiers of these properties would maintain an acceptable outlook.

Conditions

27. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring matching materials to safeguard the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area.

Conclusion

28. For the reasons set out above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S Brook

INSPECTOR