The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2020

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/20/3253529
66 Blackhill Lane, Knutsford, WA16 0EQ

- 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 Eddowes against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
- The application Ref 20/0796M, dated 20 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2020.
- The development proposed is single storey / two storey front and rear extensions.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey / two storey front and rear extensions at 66 Blackhill Lane, Knutsford, WA16 0EQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/0796M, dated 20 February 2020, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 19-512 (EXT)10; 19-512 (EXT)20; 19-512 (EXT)21; 19-512 (EXT)40; 19-512 (EXT)45; 19-512 (HPL)10; 19-512 (HPL)11; 19-512 (HPL)20; 19-512 (HPL)21; 19-512 (HPL)40.

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

   4) The development shall be undertaken in complete accordance with the tree protection measures set out in the Arboricultural Method Statement by Mulberry (Ref: TRE/66BL, dated 15 April 2020). No storage of materials or machinery, parking of vehicles, deposit or excavation of soil or rubble, or the lighting of fires shall take place within any fenced off or otherwise protected area.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property consists of a modern detached house on the corner of Bexton Road and Blackhill Lane. It is situated within an estate of similar

dwellings that have a relatively consistent character and style. However, there is some variation in the design of the individual houses, and a number have been subject to later extensions that are visible from the road. In this regard, Nos 64 and 66 are the only properties along Blackhill Lane with a catslide roof design, and the properties to the east have a traditional 2 storey appearance. Moreover, Nos 88 and 90 Bexton Road have recent front extensions that are comparable to the appeal proposal and have successfully integrated into the street. Whilst the appeal property is in a corner position, views of its front elevation from Bexton Road are obscured by 2 mature trees in the adjoining amenity strip. These would serve to limit the prominence of these extensions within the street. The Cedar Tree closest to the property is also an evergreen species that would provide a year-round screen.

4. The proposed extensions would significantly alter the appearance of the property and would introduce a projecting 2 storey front gable. However, given the existing variation along the street and the presence of similar extensions nearby, I do not consider that it would appear out of place. Moreover, I note that the building line along this part of Blackhill Lane is stepped towards the appeal property, and the extension would be seen in this context.

5. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. It would therefore accord with Policies SD 2 and SE 1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (2017), saved Policy DC2 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan (2004), and Policies D1, D2, and H3 of the Knutsford Neighbourhood Plan (2019). These policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that domestic extensions are of good design, are in proportion to the original building, and contribute positively to the character of the area.

Conditions

6. The Council suggested a number of conditions, some of which I have edited for clarity and enforceability. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition that requires the development to accord with the approved plans. This is necessary in the interest of certainty. A condition requiring that the extension make use of matching materials is necessary in order to preserve the character and appearance of the area. A further condition relating to the Arboricultural Method Statement is necessary to ensure that existing trees on the site are protected during the construction program.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR