
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 May 2017

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/17/3167797
142 Buxton Road, Disley, SK12 2HG

- 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 Miss Gillian Anderson against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 16/5500M, dated 11 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a side extension to first floor above existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a side extension to first floor above existing garage at 142 Buxton Road, Disley, SK12 2HG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/5500M, dated 11 November 2016, and the plans submitted with it, 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: 165/001; 165/010A; 165/015A; 165/020; 165/210A; 165/215B; 165/220.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Miss Gillian Anderson against Cheshire East Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling on the southern side of Buxton Road. It is set back from the road, and sits within a short row of similar properties.
-

5. The appeal property has an existing single storey side extension that incorporates a garage. This has a relatively steep pitched lean-to roof that significantly increases its size. It is the only property in the row to have been extended in this way. The existing extension has already significantly narrowed the gap between the appeal property and No 140, and the development would not encroach any further. While there would be a modest increase in the height of the existing extension, this would have only a limited effect on the spaciousness of the existing plot. The dwelling would not appear significantly more cramped than at present in my view. The development would also serve to harmonise the extension with the original dwelling and ensure a greater consistency of design. In this regard it would improve the appearance of the property.
6. The appellant has provided evidence that there is currently a 1 metre gap between the edge of the existing extension and the boundary, and this appeared to be the case on my site visit. Given that the development would not narrow this gap any further, the extension would comply with the criteria in Policy DC43 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan (2004). The retained gap, and the difference in height between the properties, would also militate against any terracing effect should No 140 be extended in the future.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with Policies DC1, DC2 and DC43 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan (2004). These policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that extensions are sympathetic to the host property and the surrounding area. It would also accord with the National Planning Policy Framework, which encourages good design.

Other Matter

8. It is agreed between the parties that the development would not be inappropriate development in Green Belt. I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition that requires the development to accord with the approved plans. This is necessary for clarity and to ensure a satisfactory development. I have also imposed a condition that requires the materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development to match the existing building. This condition is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR