

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2016

by Alexander Walker MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 30th September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/W/16/3150439

1 Lindow Parade, Wilmslow, Cheshire East SK9 5JL

- 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 Benjamin Cowen of Better Properties Ltd against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 15/4692M, dated 17 July 2015, was refused by notice dated 29 February 2016.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing single storey garage block and erection of 3 No. three storey town houses.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have considered the proposal on the basis of the amended plans submitted to the council which include the pitched roof running the length of the three properties.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a block of garages that are accessed off Buckingham Road. The immediate area comprises a mix of retail, commercial and residential uses. Although there is a variety of buildings in terms of design and sizes, there is general uniformity in their building lines.
 5. Directly to the south and west of the site is Lindow Parade, which embraces the junction of Chapel Lane and Oak Lane. The Parade predominantly comprises a row of terrace properties that have retail uses on the ground floor with residential units above. Properties within the locality are generally two-storeys in height; however, the main, central section of the Parade is three-storey.
 6. There is a distinctive hierarchy between the Parade and the neighbouring residential properties. Due to its scale and height, the mixed-use Parade is a landmark feature within the streetscene with surrounding residential properties being predominantly two-storeys in height. The two-storey elements at either
-

- end provide an important transition between the larger three-storey element and the neighbouring two-storey properties.
7. Buckingham Road predominantly comprises two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings. The two-storey height of these dwellings and Nos 1 and 2 Lindow Parade provide some continuity in the streetscene, although I recognise that there is some distance between the properties.
 8. Whilst it lies between the Parade and the dwellings to the north, the appeal site is closer to the Parade. Nevertheless, the site is some distance from Chapel Lane itself and the dwellings would have a frontage with Buckingham Road and therefore would be read in the context of its streetscene, not that of Chapel Lane. Although there are mature trees to the north of the site, these only partially screen the existing dwellings, and this effect would be significantly reduced during winter months.
 9. As a result of their height, approximately 9.9m, the three-storey dwellings would be significantly higher than the neighbouring two-storey element of the Parade at Nos 1 and 2 Lindow Parade and the detached dwellings to the north. Consequently, it would disrupt the existing rhythm of two-storey residential properties on Buckingham Road and would appear incongruous in the streetscene.
 10. I note the appellant's argument that the development would be read against the backdrop of the three-storey parade. However, the parade is a mixed-use development that plays an important dominant role in the streetscene which the proposal would unacceptably compete with rather than be subservient to, as with other dwellings on Buckingham Road and Oak Lane.
 11. I note the proposed use of materials which generally do not reflect the existing palette of materials in the vicinity. Whilst the limited use of the materials themselves would not necessarily be harmful to the character of the area, their marked contrast to the prevailing brick finish would only exacerbate the proposals incongruity in the streetscene.
 12. I find therefore that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to saved Policies BE1 and DC1 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan (LP), which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development is of a high standard of design that reflects local character. Furthermore, it would fail to accord with the general design principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

13. Whilst the proposal meets the requirements of other policies referred to me by the appellant, it does not comply with the policies of the local plan as a whole as seen in my reasoning above.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, having considered all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Alexander Walker

INSPECTOR