

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 September 2016

by Elizabeth Pleasant DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/D0650/D/16/3155817
24 Seaton Park, Runcorn, Halton WA7 1XA

- 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 Michael Hobson against the decision of Halton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00121/FUL, dated 23 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is two storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development on the application form and proposed plans is for a two storey front extension. Despite the Council's reason for refusal making reference to a proposed rear/side extension and a large two-storey side extension, it is clear from the Officer Delegated Report that the Council's concerns were with the proposed two storey front extension shown on the proposed plans. I shall deal with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and area generally.

Reasons

4. Seaton Park is a residential cul-de-sac characterised by detached and semi-detached properties which vary in their individual design characteristics and form. No 24 Seaton Park is a detached property and is situated in a part of the street which is visually prominent as you enter Seaton Park. Its projecting front garage, with a lean-to roof extending over it and the front entrance door, is a consistent design characteristic of many of the properties within the street. These projecting elements provide relief and interest to the front façades of these dwellings.
 5. Whilst the proposed front extension would not extend beyond the established building line of No 24, its appearance would still be unduly dominant. There are examples of properties nearby which have been designed and laid out with a gable fronting towards the street, however the appeal property displays a
-

quite different original design and form. The introduction of a front gable onto No 24 would, by reason of its great width and shallow roof form, present a dominant façade to the street which would appear visually incongruous. Whilst the overall additional floor space it would create is not significant, the gable form would present a dominant bulk onto the front of the property with little visual relief. As a result it would detract from the appearance of the host property and the street scene as a whole.

6. I have taken into consideration the lack of objections from neighbours; however this does not justify the harm I have identified which would be permanent.
7. I conclude that the appeal proposal would adversely affect the character and appearance of the dwelling and area generally. I therefore find conflict with Policies BE2 and H6 of the Halton Unitary Development Plan, 2005 which seek to ensure, amongst other criteria, that new development respects the nature and character of the area and that extensions do not unacceptably alter the appearance or character of the original dwelling. Furthermore, I also find conflict with Halton Borough Council's House Extensions, Supplementary Planning Document, 2006 which seeks to ensure that front extensions are designed to respect and harmonise with the existing property.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elizabeth Pleasant

INSPECTOR