



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 May 2019

by **Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 May 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M2325/D/19/3220786

14 Ramsgate Close, Bryning With Warton PR4 1YF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Rachel Stretch against the decision of Fylde Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/0721, dated 11 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is attached modular garage store garden building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I could see from my site visit that the proposal had already been erected in accordance with the submitted plans. Furthermore, the external surface of the extension accords with the materials detailed on the planning application form. I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.
3. The description of development in the heading has been taken from the planning application form. Part E of the appeal form states that the description of development has changed, and reference is made to the building being used for 'bakery storage'. Despite this, the plans show that a modular garage building is proposed. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The host property is a semi-detached house on Ramsgate Close. The close forms part of a housing estate within the settlement of Warton. The appeal property is situated on a corner plot and its front and side elevations face the highway. Neighbouring properties are similar in style and design. A number benefit from extensions. Properties within Ramsgate Close are built in different shades of brick and render, but these are applied consistently across houses in the area which contributes to the character and appearance of the close.
6. The extension is of a modular construction. This itself is not harmful, but the use of pebble dash and corrugated sheeting for the roof of the extension do not match the materials used in the host property or those used widely in the

close. As a result, the extension is not in keeping with the host property or the street scene. Although a planning condition could potentially be used to ensure that appropriate materials are used, this would be likely to require the complete re-build of the extension's exterior. Such a condition would be wider in scope than necessary and as there are no details before me of potential alternative materials, I am of the view that a condition could not be drafted with enough precision.

7. I note the appellant's wish to work from home and the personal circumstances relating to the case. Moreover, I recognise that the appellant has sought to obtain planning permission from the Council. However, the creation of high-quality buildings is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Hence, these matters do not alter or outweigh my findings on the proposal before me, which I have considered on its merits.
8. Consequently, despite the extension being of an appropriate scale, mass, layout and design, I conclude that significant harm is caused to the character and appearance of the area as a result of the materials used. The proposal does not therefore accord with Policy GD7 of the Fylde Local Plan To 2032 and paragraph 127 d) of the National Planning Policy Framework. Together, these expect, among other things, development to establish or maintain a strong sense of place using a high standard of design by taking account of the character and appearance of the local area and ensuring the materials relate well to the surrounding context.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR