



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2019

by A Denby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/19/3231009

Rustlings, Vale Royal Drive, Whitegate, Winsford CW8 2BA

- 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 Dr Paul Cronin against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00220/FUL, dated 15 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'a three-bay detached garage to the front of the property. It will be oak framed on a brick plinth with matching tiles to the roof of the current building and with larch weatherboarding. There is a small cover for the bins and a small bike store attached'.
-

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 surrounding area and host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The site is a large detached dwelling and is the end property on this section of Vale Royal Drive which slopes gently up towards the site from its junction with Sutton Field. There is no defined building line to Vale Royal Drive though all properties are set well back from the road behind a substantial grass verge with mature tree planting. This, along with the woodland and open fields adjacent, results in the surrounding area having a semi-rural character and appearance.
4. The site frontage is enclosed with a brick wall / railings though visually the site frontage retains an open character and there are views through to the existing dwelling from the surrounding area.
5. The proposed garage would be a substantial structure and due to its positioning to the front of the existing building would be a prominent feature when viewed from the public realm.
6. There would be limited separation between the garage and the host dwelling and due to this proximity and the overall size and bulk of the garage

proposed, any separation would not be readily perceived from the surrounding area. The garage would compete with the host dwelling and detract from the established open character of the site and surrounding area.

7. I note the appellant has indicated that the garage would be lowered into the site by approximately 1.5m and larch wood weatherboarding utilised to blend the development into the landscaped setting. Whilst these measures may aid in reducing the visual impact of the garage, I do not consider they would be sufficient to fully mitigate the harm that I have identified.
8. Even with the garage being lowered into the site due to its overall size and bulk, particularly the roof, it would still be viewed as a substantial structure in a prominent position. It would introduce a sense of enclosure to the site frontage, adversely impacting on its current open character and appearance.
9. The appellant has suggested that the proposal would be in keeping with nearby development on St Marys Drive. I viewed this development on site and noted that a number of the properties do have large detached garages positioned forward of the main dwelling, often with accommodation above.
10. However, the development on St Marys Drive has a very different character and appearance to the appeal site. The garages appear to have been constructed at the same time as the host dwellings and considered as part of the overall design concept for this area.
11. The appeal site is physically and visually separated from this development by the extensive woodland opposite. The existing character and appearance of the appeal site and its immediate environs is not directly comparable to St Marys Drive.
12. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy ENV6 of the Cheshire West and Chester local plan and retained policy H8 of the Vale Royal Borough Local Plan which seek to ensure that developments respect local character and their scale, design, materials are considered in relation to the existing property, adjacent properties and the surrounding setting.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Denby

INSPECTOR