



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2019

by J M Tweddle BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M2325/D/19/3232386 5 The Leylands, Lytham St Annes FY8 5QS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs D Cunningham against the decision of Fylde Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/0113, dated 5 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'single storey side elevation'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension at 5 The Leylands, Lytham St Annes FY8 5QS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/0113, dated 5 February 2019, 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 the following approved plans: Site Location Plan PR-10, Proposed Site Plan PR-09, Proposed Rear Elevation PR-04, Proposed Side Elevation PR-05, Proposed Front Elevation PR-07, Proposed West Beach Elevation PR-08, Proposed Woodville Terrace Elevation PR-06, Proposed Ground Floor PR-01, Proposed First Floor PR-02, Proposed Second Floor PR-03, Roof Plan PR-11, Tree Constraints Plan 4151-01 and Tree Protection Plan 4151-02.
 - 3) No development shall commence until detailed specifications and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matters

2. The original description of development, as provided on the application form, was for a 'single storey side elevation'. However, from the evidence before me it is clear that the proposal amounts to a 'single storey side extension' and this is confirmed by the appellant in their statement. Therefore, for clarity, I have considered the appeal on that basis and amended the description of development in my formal decision.
3. Throughout the evidence an interchangeable reference is made to the 'Lytham Town Centre Conservation Area' and the 'Lytham Conservation Area'. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) has provided me with the definitive map of the

conservation area which is titled 'Lytham Conservation Area' and therefore, for clarity, I will refer to it as such throughout my decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, with due regard to the location of the site in the Lytham Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a pseudo Georgian style three storey brick built end of terrace townhouse dating from the 1980s. The site lies within the Lytham Conservation Area (CA) which comprises Lytham Town Centre and most of the town's seafront promenade. The CA is characterised by a tight-knit pattern of development within the historic core of the town centre, comprising attractive treelined streets with terraced housing set out in a grid formation. This is pleasantly contrast by a mix of large period villas along the seafront in generous plots and framed by the large grassed expanse of Lytham Green, flanked by its West and East beaches.
6. The appeal site and its surroundings form a looser and more modern style of development that reflect the redevelopment and evolution of this part of the CA which has a more open and spacious character. As an obvious modern addition with no apparent historical or architectural value, the appeal property makes a neutral contribution to the overall significance of the CA.
7. The proposal would introduce a single storey flat roof side extension to the eastern elevation of the host property. The extension would largely be screened from the street by the existing red brick boundary wall which rises to approximately 1.8 metres in height but would be readily visible from longer range views from Lytham Green/West Beach and on the approach from the north along Woodville Terrace. In this context, the development would be seen as a subservient and lightweight addition to the property with a contrasting and contemporary appearance owing to its low roof form and large areas of glazing to its elevations. Consequently, the proposal would not appear as an incongruous addition to the host property but rather a complementary addition that, due to its limited scale, would have a neutral impact on the overall character and appearance of the CA.
8. The proposal would introduce built form into the side garden area facing onto Woodville Terrace but its limited scale would not amount to a harmful intrusion into the open space setting of the building. A sizable area of garden would be retained and therefore maintain the spacious feel of this corner location. Furthermore, the single storey scale of the proposal in contrast with the three storey scale of the host property limits any disruption to the return building line along Woodville Terrace.
9. I have found that The Leylands makes no meaningful contribution to the overall significance of the CA and therefore its unaltered state, uniform design, materials and appearance are not at all fundamental to the character or appearance of the CA. In any case, these elements would not be significantly altered by the proposal and having considered the recent grant of planning permission for an almost identical extension at 11 The Leylands¹ I find that the proposal would maintain the

¹ LPA Ref. 17/0446

overall uniformity and symmetry of the block when viewed in its totality from the seafront. Whilst the approved development at No 11 is yet to be implemented, I find that even if the appeal proposal were to be carried out in isolation, it would not significantly alter the appearance of the host property or that of the surrounding area.

10. It is suggested that the appeal site is more visually prominent than that of No 11 and thereby providing a justification as to why that scheme was approved and the appeal proposal was refused. I accept that the appeal site is more visible from the public domain than the site at No 11, however, I am not convinced that the proposal's limited visual appearance within the street scene amounts to any harm for the reasoning I have set out above.
11. The application form suggests that the external elevations would be finished in a type of timber cladding while the proposed elevation plans show a render finish. In either case, I find that in combination with the large areas of glazing and its low profile roof, render or a suitable timber cladding would provide an acceptable and high quality contemporary finish that would not detract from the character or appearance of the area. To ensure this is the case, these details can be secured by condition.
12. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or that of the surrounding area and thus it would preserve the character and appearance of the Lytham Conservation Area. It follows, therefore that I find no conflict with policies GD7 and ENV5 of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 which together seek to achieve high standards of design that conserve, protect and, where appropriate, enhance the character, appearance, significance and historic value of designated heritage assets.

Other Matters

13. Objectors have raised the issue of property values and the loss of views. However, it is a well-founded principle that the planning system does not exist to protect private interests such as the value of land and property or private views. My attention is also drawn to the historical removal of some permitted development rights at the appeal site and reference is made to non-planning legislation. These matters do not provide any justification to withhold consent for the appeal proposal and therefore do not alter my conclusion.

Conditions

14. I have imposed a pre-commencement planning condition to require the submission of sample materials for approval by the LPA. This will ensure an appropriate external finish is achieved. The appellant has been consulted on the wording of this condition and has provided their written agreement. The standard timescale condition for implementation and a plans compliance condition are also imposed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons I have set out and subject to conditions, the appeal is allowed.

Jeff Tweddle

INSPECTOR