

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 May 2019

**by David Storrie DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 19 November 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M2325/W/19/3224056**

**2 Grosvenor Street, Lytham St Annes, FY8 5HB**

- 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 Mrs Healey against the decision of Fylde Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 18/0760, dated 26 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 22 January 2019.
  - The development proposed is the extension and roof lift to garage to facilitate conversion to residential dwelling.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary matter

2. I have taken the description of the proposed development from the appeal form as this provides a clearer description than that originally set out on the application form.
3. The site address has also been taken from the application form although the decision notice refers to 2A Grosvenor Street.

### Main Issues

4. The main issues are firstly, the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, and secondly, the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties with specific regard to overbearing and loss of privacy.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

5. The appeal site occupies a corner plot with a frontage on to Grosvenor Street and a side elevation on to South Warton Street, a minor road mainly providing access to the rear of the properties on East Beach and Warton Street that back on to it. Grosvenor Street links Warton Street to East Beach. The area is residential in character made up predominantly of Victorian detached and semi-detached houses that are tight knit in their form and layout.
6. The appeal site comprises a single storey domestic building that fronts Grosvenor Street and is attached at the rear to an existing building at the rear of 42A East Beach. No. 4 Grosvenor Street adjoins the southern boundary and

has been converted into flats whilst a single storey attached double garage with a pitched roof immediately lies to the north of the appeal site on the opposite side of South Warton Street. In this context, the existing building on the appeal site is seen as an ancillary domestic building in terms of its scale and appearance.

7. The appeal proposal involves raising the height of the existing building by some 1.2 metres, from the existing 4 metres, to provide first floor accommodation, addition of a porch on the south elevation adjacent to No. 4 Grosvenor Street, and a ground floor bay window fronting Grosvenor Street. The proposed additions would result in the scale of the building not being seen as an ancillary domestic building but would present a dwelling that is not reflective of the form and scale of existing dwellings in the area.
8. Whilst I noted the presence of the double garage extension with a dormer window in the roof space present on the adjacent dwelling to the north of the appeal site, the appeal proposal would have a higher ridge height with a gable fronting Grosvenor Street. The front gable would reflect gables on the much larger Victorian properties in the locality but would not be comparable in terms of scale and massing. This would present a form of development, in terms of its design, massing and architectural character that does not relate well to its surroundings. I also noted a smaller dwelling on the opposite side of the road; No. 3 Grosvenor Street. This was a two storey building with single storey addition set back from the road frontage and was formed from the conversion of a previous coach house. I don't consider the scale, form and location of this property to be comparable to the appeal proposal and afford it little weight in my consideration of the appeal.
9. Taking the above into account I conclude on this issue that the proposed development would be an incongruous feature in the street scene. This would be contrary to Policy GD7 d) of the Fylde Local Plan (LP) that, amongst other things, seek development of high quality that takes into account the character and appearance of an area, ensuring that the siting, layout, massing, scale, design, materials, architectural character, building to plot ratio and landscaping relate well to the surrounding context.

#### *Living conditions*

10. The proposed porch would be to the side of the building close to the boundary with No. 4 Grosvenor Street and provide the main entrance to the proposed dwelling. From my site visit I noticed that there were windows in the side wall of No. 4 facing the appeal site. I note that the 2003 planning permission for the conversion to flats indicated the side window to be removed but there was no planning condition requiring this to be done. The proposed development would bring greater activity and movement to and from the site than the previous use as a garage. As well as providing access to the dwelling, it also includes a bin store area and some amenity space. The potential increase in activity in close proximity of the side boundary between the properties could adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 4 although it could be partly mitigated by way of appropriate boundary treatment.
11. The increase in the height of the building would be by some 1.2 metres and the roof would slope away from the eastern boundary with No. 42A East Beach. It would however be seen from No. 42A from rear windows to the property and a rear courtyard. Planning permission has been granted in 2018 for a rear

extension to No. 42A that could potentially reduce any impact but I noticed it had not been constructed at the time of my site visit and I must judge the appeal on how it was at the time of my visit.

12. Taking into account the scale of increase in height, which would not be insignificant, the orientation and close proximity of the site to No. 42A, I consider that the increase in height of the existing building would have an overbearing effect on the occupiers of No. 42A, in particular when viewed from their rear amenity space, and would impact on sunlight entering the rear yard, to the detriment of the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 42A.
13. This would be contrary to LP Policy GD7 c) that, amongst other things, seek to ensure that the amenity of neighbouring properties is not adversely affected.

### **Other matters**

14. The appeal site is located in a sustainable location where the appellants suggest that the Council cannot provide a 5 year supply of housing. Consequently, in such circumstances, the balance should tip in favour of the proposed development. The Council have recently adopted their Local Plan so have an up to date Local Plan and have confirmed that they have a five year housing supply. As a consequence, the provision of one dwelling on the site does not override the concerns I have identified above.

### **Conclusion**

15. For the above reasons, I dismiss the appeal.

*David Storrie*

INSPECTOR