
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2017

by Mark Dakeyne BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/16/3161649

Charleston, Blakemere Lane, Norley, Northwich WA6 6NW

- 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 and Mrs Pyatt against the decision of Cheshire West & Chester Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02680/FUL, dated 22 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension at Charleston, Blakemere Lane, Norley, Northwich WA6 6NW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/02680/FUL, dated 22 June 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Existing Site and Ground Floor Plan Drawing No. 1218-EX-101, Proposed Site and Ground Floor Plan Drawing No. 1218-PL-101, Existing Loft and Roof Plan Drawing No. 1218-EX-102, Proposed Loft and Roof Plan Drawing No. 1218-PL-102, Existing Elevations Drawing No. 1218-EX-110 and Proposed Elevations Drawing No. 1218-PL-110 (all Revision 0).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the extension would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies.

Reasons

3. The appeal property lies within the North Cheshire Green Belt. Paragraph 89 of the Framework states that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate development unless it is one of 6 specified exceptions. The exception that needs to be considered in this case is 'the
-

- extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.'
4. The property has been extended previously. According to the Council the existing and proposed extensions would result in a cumulative increase in floorspace of about 95% compared to the original dwelling. On the face of it the current scheme could be considered to represent a disproportionate addition to the building.
 5. That said in practical terms the dwelling as extended would maintain the appearance of a modest building set back from the road by some distance behind a double garage and mature landscaping. The extension would not significantly alter the bulk or form of the bungalow as seen from any public viewpoints. The dwelling would remain smaller than many nearby.
 6. Moreover, the surrounding context is relevant. The property forms part of one of the ribbons of development which extend out from the crossroads a short distance to the north and which together form the small elongated settlement of Hatchmere. For this reason the site and its immediate surroundings do not have the characteristics of open countryside or undeveloped Green Belt land.
 7. Taking into account the above, the extension would not materially affect Green Belt openness or Green Belt purposes¹ such as safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
 8. All in all and notwithstanding the increase in footprint which would ensue, I conclude that the extension would not be disproportionate and as a result would not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the Framework and relevant development plan policies. In arriving at this conclusion I note that Policy STRAT 9 of the Local Plan (Part One)² refers to the restrictions contained within the Framework for development in the Green Belt. Policy H8 of the Vale Royal Borough Local Plan does not have any detailed criteria for assessing whether an extension would be disproportionate. As the extension would not be disproportionate it would comply with Policy H8.
 9. The proposal would not have any material impact on the character and appearance of the area or the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers due to its acceptable design, discrete siting, separation from adjacent properties and the screening to the site boundaries.
 10. In allowing the appeal and granting planning permission I will impose a condition requiring compliance with the approved plans for certainty. A condition ensuring matching materials is also necessary in the interests of the appearance of the property and its surroundings.
 11. For the above reasons the appeal should be allowed.

Mark Dakeyne

INSPECTOR

¹ As set out in paragraph 80 of the Framework

² Cheshire West and Chester Council Local Plan (Part One) Strategic Policies adopted January 2015