



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2019 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/19/3235118

48 Alexandra Road, Stockton Heath, Warrington WA4 2AN

- 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 Dan Bloor against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 2019/34713, dated 18 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The neighbouring dwellings in the street scene match the design of no.48 with some variation in materials and detailing. The front elevation for no.48 has been rendered on the first floor and has exposed brick on the ground floor. The properties along the road are typically two storey, semi-detached with large driveways and front gardens. The semi-detached pairs are typically on relatively wide plots that have not been built up to the boundary. This, combined with the trees and hedgerows that line the opposite side of the road, contributes to the suburban character of the street scene.
5. The proposal comprises a two-storey side extension and a single storey rear extension, both of which would be rendered. The side extension would include a door on the ground floor and windows on the first floor. The rear extension includes large bi-fold doors that are around the full width of the extension.
6. Due to the size and location of the rear single storey extension this would appear subordinate to the host dwelling. The use of render on the ground floor extension would not match the existing building which has exposed brick over

both floors of the host property. Despite this the rear extension would not be visible from the public domain and the use of render would cause limited harm to the appearance of the rear of the building. The large bi-fold doors on the rear extension would appear at odds with the appearance of the host dwelling due to the inclusion of a large area of continuous glazing that is not common in the host dwelling. Despite this, the harm this would cause to the appearance of the host dwelling would also be limited.

7. The roof of the side extension would have a lower ridge height than the host property and the first floor of the side extension would be stepped back from the front of the property, whilst the ground floor of the extension would be level with the host dwelling. Due to the set back on the first floor and the reduced ridge height, the extension would appear subordinate to the host property, notwithstanding the choice of materials. The plans show that the extension would be rendered on both floors, which would not match the host dwelling. This would cause limited harm to the appearance of the building and would make the extension appear more prominent due to the unmatched materials. Therefore, the size and design of the extension would appear subordinate to the host dwelling, albeit the choice of materials would cause limited visual harm to the appearance of the building.
8. The proposed development would not retain a 1 metre separation distance from the western boundary on the first floor and as such the extension would be built close to the neighbouring property, which has a single storey extension built up to its boundary. Whilst a gap would be retained on the first floor, this would only be retained due to the neighbouring properties single storey side extension. The proposed extension would limit the possibility for the neighbouring property to extend above the existing ground floor extension as this could lead to a terracing effect. The reduced ridge height and the first floor set back would partly reduce the terracing effect caused by the proposed extension. Despite this, these design choices would not be enough to negate the harm caused by the terracing effect the extension would have on the street scene.
9. The proposals would be contrary to the Housing Extension Guidelines (SPG) that notes that in cases where it is not possible to ensure an extension is set 1 metre from the boundary then in such cases a two-storey extension may not be suitable as this would lead to a terracing effect. Whilst the SPG is not policy, the guidance was adopted in 2016, after the adoption of the first National Planning Policy Framework and there is no evidence before me that the guidance within it should not be given appropriate weight.
10. The appellants have referred to other properties that have been extended in the immediate area that did not include a 1 m step in on the first floor. Whilst these dwellings may not have included such a step in, there are several other properties on the street and the wider area that had been extended and have a 1 m step in on the first floor. With regard to the dwellings identified by the appellants, it appears that those dwellings have retained a 1m gap over both floors between the extension and the neighbouring property. As such these developments have not created a terracing effect thus the quality of the street scene has not fundamentally changed. The Council granting planning permission for a similar scheme does not justify this proposal.

11. The proposed extension would be subordinate to the host dwelling, but the design and choice of materials would cause limited harm to its character and appearance. Nonetheless, I find that the terracing effect that would be caused by the proposed extension would adversely harm the character and appearance of the street scene. Therefore, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies QE6 and QE7 of the Local Plan Core Strategy and the guidance set out in the SPG.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR