
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2017

by D Guiver LLB(Hons) Solicitor

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

Decision date: 10th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/17/3179397

**5 Wrights Green, Lumb Brook Road. Appleton, Warrington, Cheshire
WA4 3HN**

- 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 C Foreman against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2017/29932, dated 28 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey front and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Wrights Green is a small cluster of houses on Lumb Brook Road, opposite the junction with Dingle Lane. On the northern side of the road there are a few short terraces of four or so houses each and a number of pairs of two-storey, red-brick semi-detached houses with grey pantile hipped roofs. To the south lay open fields and with the exception of some farm buildings, the landscape is similar for some distance on all sides around the site.
4. The road runs roughly east to west but sweeps round to the north close to the junction. There are four pairs of semi-detached properties sitting on, or close to the bend and the appeal property is part of the third pair counting from west to east. These properties are set back from the road behind approximately ten-metre front gardens.
5. The appeal property has a small porch extension to the front of the building and the front garden is block-paved. The front garden boundary comprises a low close-boarded fence to the east which is perpendicular to the front of the property and a low hedge to the west. The hedge is angled away from the house by 15° or so.
6. The proposed extension would replace the existing porch and would be constructed parallel to the western border and project approximately

5.5 metres forward of the building's main front elevation. The resulting construction would, like the hedge, project out from the appeal property at a roughly 15° deflection from the perpendicular.

7. The location close to the bend in the road gives the appeal site a prominent position. The current building line of the appeal property matches the neighbouring properties and follows the curvature of the carriageway. The proposed extension would dominate the view when approaching the bend from both east and west.
8. The extension would be an incongruous and bulky addition to the building by reason of its size and the deflection from the orientation of the semi-detached pair. The location at the bend on Lumb Brook Road would disrupt the view along the road and would be an alien intrusion into current building line and would have an unacceptable detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. Therefore, I conclude that the development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area contrary to Policies CS1 and QE7 of the Warrington Borough Council Local Plan Core Strategy 2014, which together seek to ensure that developments achieve high standards of design and enhance the character and appearance of buildings and the area in which they are situated.

Other Matters

10. The potential for the proposed extension to impact on light to neighbouring properties was raised as an issue by interested parties. However, the orientation of the proposal and the east to west line of the street means that any impact on light would be minimal. However, while I give little weight to this issue it is not a sufficient consideration to overcome the unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area and the host building that would arise from the proposal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D Guiver

INSPECTOR