

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 May 2017

by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 02 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/17/3171699

The Haybarn, Eaton Road, Wettenhall, Winsford, CW7 4HJ.

- 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 P Owens against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref: 16/5973/N, dated 5 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the implications of the proposal for the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises one of several dwellings formed from a substantial former barn(s). Despite the fact it has been subdivided, its original identity as a massive and unadorned former agricultural building is still clearly legible. The proposed extension would be of squarish plan form with a pitched roof. A pair of windows would be in the North East and South East elevations respectively, with double width patio doors on the North West elevation.
 4. Whilst the extension would be small in scale relative to the appeal dwelling, it would amount to an obvious and incongruent projection from its North Eastern elevation which would detract from its bold rectilinear form with sweeping asymmetric roof. It would markedly undermine the simple uncluttered appearance and clean lines of this very substantial building (of which the appeal dwelling forms part), which has been converted to a high standard. In addition, the pitched roof would sit awkwardly alongside the asymmetric roof and the windows and large patio doors would impart a suburban appearance, at odds with the vernacular of the host building.
 5. The fact the extension would be built of matching materials and not sited on a principal elevation of the building would not outweigh this impact and it would be clearly visible from the adjoining road, as well as from other dwellings in this
-

complex. The appellant states that the rear of the property where the extension is proposed does not form an original part of the building. Even if that is the case, its design is consistent with that of the remainder of the building, unlike the appeal proposal.

6. I take the appellant's point that Policy NE.2 of the Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011 (2005) (LP) appears on a superficial reading to preclude extensions in the countryside, as it does not expressly refer to them. However, it does allow development for other uses appropriate to a rural area and to my mind, the extension of a rural dwelling would not in principle fall foul of it. Moreover, one needs to look at the development plan policies as a whole and it is clear that Policy RES.11 does allow for residential extensions (including those in the countryside), subject to certain criteria being met, including that they respect the design and form of the original dwelling.
7. Whilst, the Supplementary Planning Document *Extensions and Householder Development* (2008) (SPD) does potentially allow for small extensions on dwellings converted from former rural buildings, paragraph 4.10 makes it clear that they will not normally be permitted because the simple, bold, vernacular form would be compromised, which is precisely the case here.
8. Overall, for the reasons given, I conclude on the main issue that the proposed extension would fail to integrate satisfactorily with the host dwelling, which would be to the detriment of its appearance and the wider character and appearance of the area. This would bring it into conflict with Policies RES.11 and BE.2 of the LP, as well as the advice in the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek to secure a high standard of design in new development, which respects the character and form of both the original dwelling and its surroundings.

ALISON ROLAND

INSPECTOR