The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2019

by A Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/18/3218353
14 Bideford Road, Penketh, Warrington WA5 2QA

- 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 Andrew Tarburton against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
- The application Ref: 2018/33644, dated 1 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 4 December 2018.
- The development proposed is single storey rear extension, extension to front and rear dormers and detached garage to rear.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension, extension to front and rear dormers and detached garage to rear of 14 Bideford Road, Penketh, Warrington in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2018/33644, dated, subject to the following conditions:

    1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 02/18/4 (January 2018), 02/18/6 REV A (January 2018), and 02/18/BP.

    2) Details of all external facing materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any further development takes place and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are the impact of the proposed garage building upon the living conditions of neighbours with regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. The property is a semi detached dormer bungalow within an area characterised by similar properties within a residential suburban context. The property benefits from an existing planning permission for a similar development and the main issue in question is the raising of the proposed garage by around 0.7 metres from that which was previously approved.

4. I saw that the proposed garage was incomplete and sits to the rear of the site near to the rear gardens of properties on Paignton Close. The structure was of block work construction and was clearly unfinished at the time of my site visit.

5. I saw that there is a small gap of up to around 0.5 metres between the rear of the garage and the rear boundary fence and there is a slight change in level between the gardens of properties on Paignton Close with the appeal property sitting slightly lower.

6. The majority of the garage would be close to the rear boundary of 5 Paignton Close. This property has a shed abutting the common boundary to the site and therefore the perceived dominance and any loss of outlook caused by the proposed garage would be somewhat lessened due to this structure.

7. There is also a potential impact upon the living conditions of residents at 7 Paignton Close. The proposed gable end of the garage would be visible from the property and I note that concern has been raised regarding the materials of the garage, currently being in breeze block. I consider that the garage's impact on number 7 would however be lessened due to its location slightly removed from the rear boundary, as well as through the slight gap that is maintained between the boundary and number 7, as described above.

8. I consider therefore that the rear garden distance and the off set position from the boundary of number 5 and 7 Paignton Close is sufficient to alleviate the extra 0.7 metres of height as proposed in this application. The proposed garage should also be rendered appropriately in order to cover the breeze blocks and as such further relieve neighbour concerns about the visual effect of the proposed garage. I therefore condition materials to be submitted and approved by the Council.

Conclusion

9. I conclude that the proposed garage would not unduly harm the living conditions of neighbours with regard to outlook, subject to conditions requiring materials to be approved in the interests of appearance and the specification of plans in the interests of certainty. I therefore conclude that there will be no significant adverse impact upon nearby properties and as such no conflict with Policy QE6 of the Warrington Borough Council Adopted Local Plan Core Strategy

10. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all material planning considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Graham

INSPECTOR