
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2017

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/17/3179243

27 Kelsborrow Way, Kelsall, Chester CW6 0NL

- 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 Mrs Pamela Smith against the decision of Cheshire West & Chester Council.
 - The application Ref 17/01134/FUL, dated 13 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is the extension and alteration to existing bungalow to increase and modify lounge/kitchen and garage areas together with new lounge and bedroom/ensuite area in new roof space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has confirmed that their first name was spelt incorrectly on the planning application form. I have used the correct version in this decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached bungalow on Kelsborrow Way, which is characterised by modest sized pitched roof bungalows that respond to the gentle increase in ground levels from its junction with Willington Lane. As a result, the view up the road from the south of the appeal site comprises of a regular rhythm of roof planes. Nonetheless, there is some variation in the style and form of properties in different parts of Kelsborrow Way. This includes a handful of dwellings to the north-east of the appeal site beyond The Dell. These dwellings include a first floor within the roof space.
5. There is some dispute about the appeal site's context, given its location on a bend in the road. The property forms one of five modest bungalows between Fox Hill and The Dell. The middle three, which includes the appeal property, display the same design. The dwellings at either end are of a matching design to one another, but different to the three central properties. The five dwellings traverse the street scenes to the north-east and to the south. Thus, the appeal property contributes to both street scenes for different reasons. The latter is

due to the regular rhythm of roof planes; the former is due to the proximity of the appeal site to the dwellings to the north-east.

6. Assessing design involves judgement. This can lead to contrasting opinions, even among professionals. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions (SPD) explains that *each site is unique and proposals will be judged on their own individual merits, having regard to local distinctiveness and to the character of the property and the area.*
7. The proposal would increase the scale of the dwelling by raising the property's ridge height which would, in tandem with a side extension, extend its roof form to the side. This would increase the width of the dwelling beyond the flank elevation of the existing garage which would be demolished. Notably the property would keep a front and rear gable elevation. This would respect the character of the existing property and that of the row of five properties which the site forms part of.
8. However, the design, scale and massing of the proposed development would not respect the shallow pitched roofs and modest sized bungalows which the property adjoins. Among these five properties, the proposal would be a prominent change that would not reflect the character and appearance of the dwellings or achieve a sense of place. I recognise that the proposal's ridge height would not rise above that of 25 Kelsborrow Way. However, it would disrupt the steady transition, formed by the roof planes of dwellings between The Dell and those to the south of the appeal site, which characterises the appeal site's wider context. So, even if the proposal would have a similar visual appearance to a number of dwellings to the north-east, this does not negate the harm that I have identified.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would be contrary to Policy ENV6 of the Cheshire West and Chester Council Local Plan (Part One) Strategic Policies, saved Policy HO8 of the Chester District Local Plan and the SPD; which together seek to promote extensions of a high quality design that respect local character, in terms of their scale and visual appearance in relation to the existing dwelling.

Other matter

10. Although the appellant considers the officer's report contains factual errors and a flawed assessment, I have had regard to the parties' points in reaching my view on the appeal scheme.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR