



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2025

by **K Mansell BA (Hons) MPhil TP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/D/25/3365896

Southlands, Bilsborrow Lane, Bilsborrow, Lancashire PR3 0RN

- 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 Stephen Chappell against the decision of Wyre Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00143/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the building of a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Within the vicinity of the appeal site, Bilsborrow Lane is characterised by the linear arrangement of houses on both sides of the road, typically with open fields to the rear. The style, scale and siting of the properties is varied. However, they are generally set back from the highway behind a front garden, often defined by established hedgerows. The overall effect is to create a harmonious, green and open character along this part of the lane, within a wider countryside setting.
4. The appeal property at Southlands is a semi-detached bungalow set back behind a front garden, enclosed by a tall boundary hedge. It is accessed via a service road that runs parallel to Bilsborrow Lane, from which it is separated by a landscaped verge. This minor road serves a small number of dwellings, which share a uniform building line, each also set behind open front gardens and driveways. This arrangement contributes to the consistent and orderly appearance of the street.
5. The appeal proposal would introduce a detached garage within the front garden of Southlands, positioned close to the property's front boundary. It would have a ridge height slightly above that of the existing boundary hedge. Even if it did not give rise to overlooking or the overshadowing of neighbouring properties, its siting forward of the principal elevation would introduce built development between the house and the road that is not a typical feature of the streetscape. It would consequently appear incongruous within a context characterised by open frontages, and it would be detrimental to the established character and appearance of the street scene as a result. The use of materials to match the house would not overcome this harm.

6. My attention has been drawn to two examples where garages have been built forward of the principal elevation of a dwelling house, as well as two new dwellings that would vary in scale and design to those adjacent to them. However, full details of these cases, including the addresses of these properties, have not been put before me. Consequently, I cannot be certain as to the detailed considerations that applied in those cases. In any event, I am required to reach conclusions based on the individual circumstances and merits of this appeal, and my findings relate to the scheme before me and its impact on the immediate locality.
7. I therefore find that the appeal proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies SP4 and CDMP3 of the Wyre Local Plan 2011-2031 (incorporating partial update of 2022) (2023), which seek, amongst other matters, to ensure that development is contextually appropriate and respects or enhances the character of the area, including the open character of the countryside. It would further conflict with guidance in the Council's Extending your Home Supplementary Planning Document (2007), which includes advice that front extensions will only be permitted where they are not intrusive in the street scheme. It would also fail to accord with the general design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan, and there are no material considerations that warrant taking a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

K. Mansell

INSPECTOR