



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/19/3239755

32 Davenham Crescent, Crewe CW2 7RZ

- 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 David Tanswell against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 19/3493N, dated 23 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of existing garage with a garage in line with the main house front line and a garden room at the rear of the replacement garage, all single storey.
-

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.

Procedural Matter

3. At the time of my site visit the development had been carried out. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of No 32 Davenham Crescent and the wider area.

Reasons

5. This appeal concerns a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located within a residential area. Properties within the locality are unified in appearance, due in part to the predominant use of red brick and render to the elevations. The host dwelling is largely finished in brick. Permission is sought for a single storey side and rear extension, which provides additional living space and a garage.
6. The elevations are finished in concrete wall panels and timber boarding and the roof is grey sheeting. It is understood that the panels have been re-used from the previously demolished garage. Be that as it may, the materials have a temporary appearance and fail to reflect the prevailing character of the wider area. Whilst it is acknowledged the extension is set in line with the front

elevation of the host dwelling, this does not negate the harm the choice of materials has on the wider street scene. As such, the extension reads as an intrusive and incongruous feature in the area.

7. Additionally, the significant width and depth of the extension further exacerbates its stark appearance. Therefore, it is a highly prominent addition which dominates the host dwelling and fails to contribute positively to its character.
8. The appellant has suggested that the external finish of the extension could be altered to address any visual harm. However, there are no specific details before me and I have therefore considered the appeal based on the information provided.
9. Consequently, this proposal has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area and is therefore contrary to policies SE1 and SD2 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030, which collectively seek to ensure developments, amongst other things, protect and enhance the character of settlements and contribute positively in terms of choice of materials and external design features.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hannah Ellison

Appeal Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR