



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 December 2025

**by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 15<sup>th</sup> January 2026**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M2325/D/25/3369406**

**62 Bryning Lane, Ribby with Wrea, Lancashire PR4 2NL**

- 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 A Warbrick against the decision of Fylde Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 25/0276.
  - The development proposed is erection of a 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 area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site contains a detached bungalow that lies at the end of a row of dwellings of varied design and scale, which are set back from the highway behind front gardens and parking areas. This results in a broadly consistent building line and a spacious and open character adjoining Bryning Lane, which is not undermined by the recent residential development that has been carried out behind the frontage properties.
4. The proposed garage would be sited at the side of the bungalow, forward of its front elevation, in a position close to the front boundary. Although there would be some screening from vegetation, the garage would be seen as a prominent structure within the street scene, particularly in views when travelling in a southerly direction out of the settlement. Due to the scale and massing of the proposal, and its position forward of the building line, it would adversely affect the spacious character of Bryning Lane and would appear at odds with its prevailing character.
5. The proposed garage is the same scale and appearance as one previously permitted (the permitted garage). However, unlike the proposal, the permitted garage would be sited away from the boundary with Bryning Lane, in a position to the side of the bungalow and behind its front elevation. Consequently, it would respect the building line and would maintain the spacious and open site frontage, as would the outbuilding that is the subject of a certificate of proposed lawful development (PD garage) that I have been referred to which, similarly, would be at the side, and not forward of, the bungalow.

6. Any additional hardstanding required in connection with the permitted or PD garage to that associated with the proposal would be largely screened by the existing vegetation. Its effect on the character and appearance of the area would, therefore, be minimal. Such additional hardstanding would not increase the prominence of such buildings and would not result in either the permitted or PD garage appearing illogical in its position within the site.
7. I acknowledge that, unlike the proposal, the implementation of the permitted or PD garage would require the removal of trees. Furthermore, due to the need to remove an existing outbuilding, there would be less built development within the appeal site because of the proposed scheme. Nonetheless, for the above reasons, it has not been demonstrated that the appeal proposal would be less harmful to the character and appearance of the area than either the permitted or PD garage. These fall-back positions do not, therefore, alter my judgement that the proposal would unacceptably diminish the character and appearance of the area.
8. In reaching this conclusion I have had regard to the other sites referred to by the appellant, where development is closer to the highway boundary than the proposal, namely Wrea Green Equestrian Centre, The Birley Arms and Kellamargh Cottages. However, they are some distance away from, and not visible in views of, the appeal site. Such developments are not, therefore, components of the streetscape within which the appeal proposal would be viewed. Additionally, whilst I note that development has taken place in front of the main elevation of other dwellings on Bryning Lane and Carr Lane, it is set back from the highway boundary and/or is some distance away from the appeal site. Thus, such sites/developments do not assist in the assimilation of the proposal into its surroundings or reduce the harm that I have identified.
9. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such it would conflict with Policy GD7 of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 (incorporating Partial Review), adopted December 2021 (LP), which requires development to be of a high standard of design and to take account of the character and appearance of the local area.
10. LP Policy H7 has also been referenced in the reason for refusal. However, as this policy relates to the replacement of, and extensions to, existing homes in the countryside, which is not what is proposed, it is not relevant to this decision.

### **Other Consideration**

11. I accept that the permitted and PD garage would both be positioned where they would partially block the view from a window within the bungalow. Nonetheless, there is no compelling evidence before me to suggest that unacceptable living conditions for the occupiers of the existing dwelling would arise due to overshadowing or loss of light. Accordingly, this does not weigh in favour of the proposal to the extent that it would justify allowing the appeal.

### **Conclusion**

12. The development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.

13. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Elaine Moulton*

INSPECTOR