



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2020

**by Robert Hitchcock BSc DipCD MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 10 August 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M2325/D/20/3253405**

**13 Mitton Crescent, Kirkham PR4 2AZ**

- 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 Mr Craig Mitchell against the decision of Fylde Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 20/0174, dated 24 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2020.
  - The development proposed is a northside extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension at 13 Mitton Crescent, Kirkham PR4 2AZ, in accordance with the terms of application ref. 20/0174, dated 24 November 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: Proposed Plans and Elevations – Drawing no. 1 of 3; Location Plan Drawing no. 2 of 3; and Site Block Plan – Drawing no.3 of 3.
  - (3) The external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing building.

### Procedural Matter

2. The description of development shown on the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form. However, the Council have referred to a single storey side extension both in its notifications of the proposed development and its decision notice. I have used this description removing references to a previous planning application as it provides a more accurate description of the proposed development. It does not change the development for which planning permission was sought. The appellant uses a similar description on their appeal form and consequently I am satisfied that no party will be prejudiced by my use of it.

### Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the locality.

## Reasons

4. The site is located in an open plan residential estate of mainly semi-detached and detached two-storey dwellings. The buildings are set behind front gardens and benefit from private amenity spaces to the rear. The property is a corner plot fronting Mitton Crescent with enclosed gardens to the side and rear adjacent to Brooklands Avenue.
5. The proposal would provide additional ground floor accommodation utilising the full depth of the existing side elevation facing Brooklands Avenue. The front elevation of the extension would be set flush with the principal elevation to Mitton Crescent and, according to the Council's report, the extension would project sideways by about 3 metres with a 15° mono-pitched roof over. The extension would be finished in materials to match the existing building.
6. The scale and form of the extension would appear subordinate to the existing building on account of the single storey additive design. In the context of the variety of extensions, outbuildings and roof designs visible on the estate, the proposal would sit comfortably against the larger scale dwelling and integrate well with it through the use of matching materials.
7. The proposal would encroach towards the side boundary to Brooklands Avenue. At the time of my site inspection this boundary consisted of a dense high hedge to the front corner of the plot and close-board timber fences of a similar height to the rear and rear side. Unlike the regimented and open-fronted development on the northern side of Brooklands Avenue, the southern side consists of several end-of-row dwellings on the roads leading up to it, and a single pair of semi-detached dwellings which are skewed to the road frontage. Additionally, smaller garages, accessed from Brookfield Avenue, sit between the end houses of Flaxfield Way and Mitton Crescent.
8. Being substantially made up of corner plots, the southern side of the road has little of the open character and consistency of development elsewhere on the estate. The well-spaced dwellings along its length are interjected by staggered subordinate development including the garages, side extensions, sheds and screening boundary treatments of various forms and heights. As such, it lacks the openness created by the absence of enclosed frontage boundaries to properties elsewhere on the estate.
9. The position and scale of the extension would benefit from the screening effect of the existing high fence and hedge such that much of the side and rear elevations would not be readily visible from outside the site. Although the rear corner of the extension would lie close to the side boundary fence, the limited eaves height combined with the roof pitching away from the boundary would cause the development to have little visual consequence in the context of the Brookfield Avenue street scene.
10. Only the upper parts of the development would be easily visible on approach from Flaxfield Way and views would mainly be seen against the backdrop of 28 Mitton Crescent on account of the staggered positions of dwellings along that road. On approach along Mitton Crescent, the greater gap to the external boundary would maintain a sense of spaciousness at and about the nearby junction such that the proposal would not visibly impose upon it.

11. Accordingly, I find that the development would not be unduly prominent or discordant in its setting. Furthermore, the subordinate scale and simple design of the proposal would be consistent with the pattern and form of local development such that, when taken with the existing level of screening, any impact on the Mitton Crescent and Brookfield Avenue street scenes would be very limited.
12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would meet the requirements of Policy GD7 of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 (2018) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as they seek to secure high quality design for new development that takes account of the character and appearance of its locality.

### **Conditions**

13. I have considered the suggested conditions from the Council and had regard to Paragraph 55 of the Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance in terms of the use of planning conditions. In addition to the standard condition limiting the lifespan of the planning permission, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching external surfaces is necessary and reasonable in the interest of the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion**

14. For the above reasons, the appeal should be allowed.

*R Hitchcock*

INSPECTOR