



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2019

by J M Tweddle BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/19/3232709

115 Abbey Road, Elworth, Cheshire CW11 3HB

- 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 Keith Herbert against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 19/1057C, dated 21 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Abbey Road is a residential street predominantly characterised by semi-detached two storey dwellings. While there is some variation in design, the properties generally comprise of two storey bay windows and hipped roofs. They are set back from the road behind a wide tree-lined verge with long cross-over driveways. Houses are typically separated by a narrow driveway to the side of each dwelling creating a spacious feel and a degree of uniformity and rhythm to the street.
4. 115 Abbey Road is one of a pair of six semi-detached blocks on the south-eastern side of the street. To the right of the house is a driveway that provides access to a garage towards the rear of the property, within the back garden. Beyond the driveway is No 117, an end of terrace house as part of a short terrace of four dwellings. This property has previously been extended to provide a two storey extension to its side and up to its boundary with No 115 as a continuation of the terrace.
5. The appeal proposal would introduce a two storey side extension along the south-west facing elevation of the host dwelling, extending over the driveway and up to its boundary with No 117. The removal of the gap between the appeal site and the neighbouring end of terrace property would result in a harmful terracing effect that would diminish the spacious character of the streetscene.

6. By building up to the shared boundary, adjacent to an existing two storey property, the proposal would appear as an awkward continuation of the terrace with abutting hipped roofs that would amount to a prominent and incongruous feature within the streetscene. Furthermore, the extension would unbalance the simple form and symmetrical appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties and thereby disrupt the general uniformity and rhythm of dwellings on the street.
7. My attention has been drawn to several other properties on the street which have two storey side extensions and which I observed during my visit. The extension at No 117, as discussed above, is seen as a continuation of the existing short terrace of four properties and therefore is appropriate in this context. The extensions at No's 73, 61, 33 and 17 are of a similar scale to the appeal proposal, however, they are a considerable distance from the appeal site, two of which are detached properties, and they are experienced in a different spatial context. None of these cited examples exhibit the same harmful terracing effect that would be apparent if the appeal were to succeed.
8. I recognise that the design of the proposed extension incorporates a step down in roof level and is set back from the front elevation, but this does not overcome the harmful terracing effect that I have identified.
9. Consequently, I find that the appeal proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy SE1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030, Policy H2 of the Sandbach Neighbourhood Development Plan 2010-2030 and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. Together these policies require development to achieve a high standard of design which is in keeping with, and makes a positive contribution to, its surroundings.

Other Matters

10. I appreciate that the proposal would provide additional space for the appellant's family and visiting relatives. However, the needs and aspirations of those currently occupying the dwelling are likely to be short term, compared with the permanent alterations to the streetscene that would arise as a result of the proposal. Planning decisions are made in the public interest and therefore, unfortunately, these personal circumstances do not, in my view, outweigh the harm I have found.
11. I note that there were no objections from the neighbours, however, this is a neutral factor in my determination of the appeal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons I have set out, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jeff Tweddle

INSPECTOR