
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2020

by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 18th August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/20/3252601

6 Barlow Road, Wilmslow SK9 4BE

- 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 Graham Cross against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0954M, dated 3 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable roof alteration and rear dormer construction.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant has indicated that he considers the proposed works could be constructed under permitted development rights. However, whether this is the case or not is not a matter for me to determine in the context of an appeal made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. It is open to the appellant to apply to the Council to have the matter determined under sections 191 or 192 of the Act. Any such application would be unaffected by my determination of this appeal. I have determined the appeal on the basis that it was applied for.
3. The application was made in the name of Mr Graham Shaw whereas the appeal form is made in the name of Mr Graham Cross. It has been confirmed that the agent made a drafting error on the application form and that the applicant's name is Mr Graham Cross as shown on the appeal form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached house located within a row, and opposite a row, of identical properties. The Council have raised no objection to the rear dormer that would be created as part of the loft conversion, and their concern relates solely to the alteration of the roof from a hip to a gable end. From what I have seen and read I see no reason to come to a different conclusion with regard to the dormer.
6. Although a few of the houses in the immediate vicinity have had extensions and alterations that have affected the roof, they have retained a hipped roof

form. The identical design of the houses gives a very strong character to this part of Barlow Road. Whilst the design of the houses changes further along the road, the predominant roof form remains that of hipped roofs, and this contributes to the strong character and appearance of the area.

7. The proposed alteration of the roof of this dwelling to a gable end would therefore be a prominent and incongruous feature that would be out of character with the surrounding area. In particular, the greater mass and scale of the roof form would unbalance the pair of semi-detached houses to the visual detriment of the area.
8. The appellant has suggested that hip to gable roof alterations are common place in the wider area and that many modern housing developments have a range of roof types. Be that as it may, in the immediate vicinity of the site there are no such alterations and hipped roofs are a characteristic feature.
9. In support of the appeal my attention was drawn to a number of examples of similar roof alterations within the borough, but only one of these was in the wider area surrounding the appeal site. This was on a road that had little consistency in terms of the design of dwellings or the types of roof. As such, it is not a direct parallel to the appeal scheme. The other examples were in different areas and towns, and whilst the appellant has provided photographs of each house, I do not know the consistency in house design and roof form on the roads where they are sited. As a result, I do not know how similar their circumstances are to the appeal site. In any event, these confirmed that inappropriate alterations to roofs are detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property, and so do not set a precedent that should be followed. Thus, they do not justify allowing the appeal scheme.
10. Overall, I consider that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policies SD2 and SE1 of the *Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (adopted July 2017)*, Policy DC2 of the *Macclesfield Borough Local Plan (adopted January 2004)*, and Policy H2 of the *Wilmslow Neighbourhood Plan (made November 2019)* which require development to have a high quality of design that protects, reinforces and contributes positively to the character and identity of the area.
11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR