



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 September 2019

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/19/3231640

15 Tattenhall Road, Tattenhall, Chester CH3 9QQ

- 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 James Stubbs against the decision of Cheshire West & Chester Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01583/FUL, dated 24 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension and single storey rear extension demolition of attached garage.
-

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 dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modern detached residential property situated in an area where similar properties, including semi-detached properties, predominate.
4. The proposed two storey side extension would replace the flat roofed single storey attached garage and would be flush with the front elevation and the full height of the property. The submitted plans show that the proposed rear extension would extend the full width of the extended property, projecting approximately 3metres from the rear elevation.
5. As such, the proposed extension would not incorporate any set down at the roof level or set back from the front elevation as required by the Chester City Council House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD).
6. In the absence of a clear set down in height and set back from the front elevation of the property, the proposed extension would not appear subordinate to the host dwelling and would therefore appear as a prominent and incongruous feature within the streetscene harming the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
7. I noted at my site visit that there are a number of other properties in the surrounding area, including 19 Tattenhall Road, that have already undergone extensions similar to that proposed here. However, the presence of these

extensions does not persuade me as to the acceptability of the extension proposed here.

8. As such, the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area contrary to policy ENV 6 of the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (Part One), Policy 2 of the Tattenhall Neighbourhood Plan and the SPD in so far as they seek to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

9. The Appellant details that the proposed extension would have been acceptable under earlier guidelines. While the Appellant's frustration is understandable, applications for planning permission have to be determined in accordance with the current development plan and material considerations.
10. Furthermore, I note the absence of any objections from the occupiers of neighbouring properties and indeed a letter of support for the proposals, this does not however outweigh the harm I have identified previously.

Conclusion

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

Mark Brooker

INSPECTOR