

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2018

**by Nicholas Taylor BA(Hons) MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 26 March 2018**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M2325/D/17/3192231**

**434 Clifton Drive North, Lytham St Anne's FY8 2PW**

- 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 D Woods against the decision of Fylde Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 17/0669, dated 6 August 2017, was refused by notice dated 3 October 2017.
  - The development proposed is extension to garage at lower ground floor level.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. In her evidence, the appellant describes a number of alternative designs for the proposed development. However, these appear to have not been formally submitted to the Council and not consulted upon. Accordingly, I confirm that I have determined the appeal on the plans which formed the basis of the Council's decision.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dormer bungalow, occupying a corner location on a main road in a residential area. The mainly detached and varied one and two storey dwellings on Clifton Drive North are, like the appeal property, within sizeable front gardens and well set back from the wide road. Although many have staggered front elevations, a consistent building line has been retained. These factors, together with few trees and shrubs of any significant scale, create an open and spacious streetscape which is a defining characteristic of this coastal locality.
5. At present, the property has a flat-roofed garage at the side which, together with part of the front garden and driveway, is partially situated below the prevailing ground level. The proposed development would comprise an extension to the existing garage, projecting 5 metres in front of it with a low-angled pitched roof culminating in a gable and ridge at a height of 3.4 metres.
6. The prominence of the garage extension would be reduced by the sunken ground level and I accept that the shrubbery around part of the front and side

boundary, which partially screens the front of the property, is likely to remain in future to afford privacy from a bus stop on the pavement. However, the pitched roof and front gable would still be visible from a number of angles, including over parts of the boundary wall and through the two driveway entrances, even if they were to have solid gates fitted. The development would be visible by pedestrians and occupants of larger vehicles on the highways as well as from the upper floors of dwellings opposite. Moreover, the pitched roof would also, visually, relate uncomfortably to the existing flat garage roof behind it and the gabled front elevation of the adjacent bungalow.

7. Overall, the proposed structure, particularly its pitched roof and gable, projecting beyond the established building line, would represent an obtrusive and uncharacteristic feature in the open and spacious streetscape, causing unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. I am also mindful that, to allow such a development would risk creating a precedent which would could, if replicated, ultimately, lead to very significant erosion of this character.
8. The scheme would conflict with saved Policy HL5 of the *Fylde Borough Local Plan* and Policy GD7 of the emerging *Fylde Local Plan to 2032*, which both seek to achieve new development of good design which relates well to its context. However, as I have been given limited information regarding the progress of the emerging plan, I afford less than full weight to the conflict with it. The proposal would also fail to comply with the *Saint Anne's on the Sea Neighbourhood Development Plan*, in particular Policy DH1, which requires development to contribute to the vision of a distinctive garden town by the sea, and Policy DH2 which seeks to protect and improve the quality of the Clifton Drive North corridor. In addition, there would be conflict with the *National Planning Policy Framework's* policies for design.
9. In reaching this conclusion, I have taken account of the various arguments put forward by the appellant. As explained in my procedural matter paragraph, I am unable to take account of the appellant's suggestions for amendments to the scheme or the property generally with the aim of making it more acceptable. At this stage, these would have to be the subject of a re-application to the local planning authority. It has not been shown that drainage improvements are dependent on the proposal. Better security for valuable vehicles would be a personal benefit which carries, at best, only very limited positive weight.
10. Any dissatisfaction with the manner of the Council's handling of the application is not for me to rule on in my decision and does not have significant bearing on my conclusion. At my site visit, I was able to see the large dwelling on North Promenade, to which the appellant refers. The houses along this one-sided sea-front street are generally of a bolder and more eclectic design to those on the inland streets and this development cannot be compared closely with the appeal proposal.

## **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be dismissed.

*Nicholas Taylor*

INSPECTOR