
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2020

by M Shrigley BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/20/3249342

14 Coldmoss Drive, Sandbach, Cheshire CW11 4HW

- 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 A Serra against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 19/5928C, dated 18 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is a "ground floor front extension and front first floor dormer extension and internal alterations to dwelling".
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The host dwelling is situated in a row of semi-detached bungalows. Properties within the row are similar in appearance set back uniformly from the highway, with evenly spaced front ground floor gable projections.
4. The Council's objections relate only to the front ground floor extension proposed therefore my decision focuses on that aspect.
5. Unlike other neighbouring dwellings within the row the host property has an existing first-floor extension above its original front gable projection. In this context, although I accept that the proposed extension is a small 'infill' addition its dimensions and prominent position would significantly exacerbate the difference in building symmetry shared with the neighbouring semi.
6. In doing so it would remove an important and consistent elevational recess prevalent along the road. The proposed pitched roof canopy as part of the extensions design would also be visible as an unduly ornate feature that is out of kilter with neighbouring dwellings. For those reasons I agree the extension would be visible as an incongruous addition which is harmful to the character and appearance of the street-scene.
7. I note brown coloured brickwork of varying tones is the main material used for external walls in the immediate vicinity of the appeal property. I also acknowledge that render would be applied to specific parts of the host dwelling, including the front elevation, rather than its entirety. However, the effect of the

material choice would highlight the incongruousness of the development. Whilst there is scope for a planning condition to be applied to secure appropriate external facing materials that approach would not overcome my concerns toward the visual impact of the proposal.

8. I conclude the proposed development would be harmful to character and appearance of the area. The development conflicts with the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030 with respect to policy SE1 which seeks that development makes a positive contribution to its surroundings and policies SD1 and SD2, which require that design achieves a sense of place and contributes positively to an areas identity. As well as policy H2 of the Sandbach Neighbourhood Plan which encourages development that is in keeping with the areas character.

Other Matters

9. I have considered policy GR9 of Congleton Borough Local Plan referred to in the Councils Decision Notice however its terms are not relevant to the grounds of appeal.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to several nearby properties in the vicinity featuring extensions visible from the road. However, the design considerations involved in those examples are not directly comparable owing to variations in footprint, character and distance from the appeal property. Nor does the presence of those extensions outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons I dismiss the appeal.

M Shrigley

INSPECTOR