



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2020

by William Walton BA MSc Dip Env Law LLM CPE BVC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/20/3255232

12 Parsonage Way, Great Sankey, Warrington WA5 1RP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Harvey Hogden against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/36720, dated 12 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a side and rear two-storey extension including alterations to front porch and comprising an enlarged kitchen, games room, office, utility room and bedroom with en suite / dressing room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area and the streetscene with particular regard to its scale and position.
3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling located on the inside of a corner on a cul-de-sac in Warrington. There is a small garden to the front, side and rear. The dwelling is bounded at the front by a low wall and along the side by a concrete wall of around 2 metres in height adorned by climbing plants. The cul-de-sac is comprised predominantly of semi-detached houses. A park lies opposite the appeal property.
4. The proposed development comprises demolition of a small single storey side extension and its replacement with a 2-storey side extension, a single storey rear and corner extension and alterations to the front porch. According to the Appellant's plans the side extension would measure 3.48 metres in width at the front of the dwelling and, due to the inclusion of a wedge-shaped element incorporating a utility room and WC, about 5.3 metres wide at the rear.
5. The rear single storey extension would project outward by about 2 metres and, owing to the corner extension, would be slightly wider than the existing dwelling. There would be a hipped roof above the side extension and the materials would match those of the existing dwelling.
6. Most of the 20 or so dwellings along Parsonage Way include modest porch extensions. Several now have garages at the side of the dwelling, some with sloping roofs. Some such as No. 17, 21 and 23 appear to have had 2-storey

side extensions added. During my visit I also saw some single storey extensions to the rear. In the main, however, at least as when viewed from the front, most of the properties have retained a strong sense of their original appearance.

7. The proposed side extension would increase the width of the original dwelling by almost 60%. Because the surrounding garden is quite modest in size the extension would take up more than half of its original width leaving a gap between the proposed development and the concrete wall of no more than about 1 metre.
8. Due to its bulk and its prominent corner position the front of the proposed 2-storey side extension would be very visible from the cul-de-sac. From the side and the rear, the upper part would also be very visible jutting out some distance from the original dwelling virtually to the side boundary wall. Consequently, it would look discordant with its neighbours and would disrupt the general visual harmony which is currently evident along Parsonage Way.
9. The single storey rear extension would hardly be seen from the cul-de-sac and would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the area or the streetscene. Whilst it is accepted that the front porch would project forward of the neighbouring porches by around 40 centimetres this would not cause any significant harm to the character and appearance of the area or the streetscene. There were no objections to the proposal from the ward or parish councillors nor, save for the porch issue referred to above, from any neighbours.
10. Notwithstanding these considerations, however, because of its bulk and its corner location the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and the streetscene. It would therefore fail to accord with Policy QE7 of the Warrington Borough Local Plan Core Strategy 2014 which seeks to promote development that reinforces local distinctiveness and enhances the character and the appearance of the streetscene and the local area.
11. It would also fail to accord with the advice in the House Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2003 that corner extensions should not block views and should not extend more than 50% of the width of the original dwelling nor take up more than 50% of the width of the garden. Although this document pre-dates the adopted Development Plan I consider that its principles are still highly relevant. Consequently, I accord it considerable weight.

Other Matters

12. The proposal would not be overbearing and so would not harm the living conditions of any neighbours. However, this matter is of neutral effect.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above the appeal should be dismissed.

William Walton

INSPECTOR