
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2017

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/17/3174494

42 Coronation Avenue, Grappenhall, Warrington, WA4 2QW

- 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 Jonathan Driver against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2017/29649, dated 19 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension and first floor extension above existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension and first floor extension above existing garage at 42 Coronation Avenue, Grappenhall, Warrington, WA4 2QW, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2017/29649, dated 19 January 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 17-004(HPL)400; 17-004(HPL)100; and 17-004(HPL)200.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling, which is situated within a residential estate. Coronation Avenue is characterised largely by semi-detached houses, a number of which have been altered and extended since they were originally built. These include two storey side and first floor side extensions. Some dwellings have also been extended at the front.
-

4. The proposal is to construct a single storey front extension, together with a first floor extension above the existing double garage. The extensions would provide more garage space, plus an additional bedroom with en-suite and dressing room accommodation. The Council contends that the proposal would be a disproportionate addition to the property, which would be harmful to its character and appearance and to that of the surrounding area.
5. Policy QE7 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy seeks to ensure that proposals are in keeping with the scale and proportions of existing buildings and that they enhance the appearance of the area. In addition, the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance – House Extensions (SPG), reaffirms that extensions should be subordinate in scale. In particular, it states that the ridgeline of the extension should be lower than that of the original dwelling and a gap of 1m between the extended property and the side boundary should be retained.
6. The appellant has referred to other extensions that have been constructed locally, two of which have been granted on appeal. However, whilst these are a material consideration, they are not directly comparable to the current appeal proposal because of their varying size and design. Accordingly, I have determined the appeal proposal on its own merits.
7. Whilst the proposed first floor side extension would be relatively wide and clearly visible from the road frontage, it would be set-back from the main front wall of the existing dwelling, which would reduce its visual impact. This set-back, together with lower ridge height (compared to the existing dwelling), would also mean that the development would appear as a subordinate addition to the property.
8. Furthermore, the angle of the roof pitch and the use of matching external materials would complement the existing building. The spacious appearance to this part of the streetscene would also be retained because of the separation distance and angular relationship with the neighbouring dwelling at number 44 Coronation Avenue. The side wall of the extension would also be inset from the side boundary by approximately 1m. These are all in accordance with the Council's SPG.
9. In my opinion, because of the size of the existing double garage, the proposal would not appear as a disproportionate addition to the existing property. It would also be of a complementary design. Consequently, it would not be unduly harmful to the appearance of the dwelling; the pair of semi-detached houses (of which the appeal property forms a part); or the streetscene. As a result, it would not conflict with the provisions of the Development Plan, as referred to above.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. These have been considered in the light of the advice contained within the Planning Practice Guidance. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

11.To ensure a satisfactory appearance, a condition requiring the use of external materials to match the existing dwelling is also necessary.

Conclusion

12.For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal should be allowed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR