
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020

by K A Taylor MSC URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/W/20/3258243
10 Town Lane, Mobberley WA16 7PY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Caleb Hutchins against Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 20/1651M, is dated 21 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is rear ground floor extension roof alterations and new dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Caleb Hutchins against Cheshire East Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a predominantly residential area. The property is a detached dormer bungalow of similar appearance in width, height and characterised with identical features including hipped roofs to existing bungalows immediately along Town Lane. It faces towards the road but is set back from the main carriageway of the B5085 Knutsford Road/Town Lane and is visible from both these roads. Despite some variation in form, the properties in the immediate area present a discreet arrangement of uniformity that appreciably contributes towards the local character.
5. The position of the property along Town Lane would result in the proposed extension and alterations to the hipped roof form by creating side gables and a forward-facing gable being clearly visible within the street scene, particularly due to the open aspect of the frontage. When this is combined with its overall scale and excessive length of roof ride across the host property with the introduction of the gable roof lines it would appear in conflict to existing neighbouring properties and as an incongruous feature to the detriment of the immediate street scene.

6. Furthermore, as I noted at the time of the site visit the bungalows along Town Lane, were mainly constructed of brick. The introduction of excessive white/cream render to the elevations, particularly to the frontage would result in the property being of a stark and alien appearance and at odds with those existing properties immediately along Town Lane. Accordingly, the proposals would detract from the character and appearance of the street scene.
7. I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would be contrary to Policies SE1 and SD2 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030, 2017 and Saved Policy DC2 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan, 2004. The aims of these policies require development proposals to make a positive contribution to their surroundings, protect and enhance the quality, distinctiveness and character of settlements; including height, scale, form and grouping, choice of materials and external design features; and respect the existing architectural features of the building.

Other Matters

8. Although the proposed development would not cause any harm to the living conditions of neighbouring properties including overshadowing, privacy and overlooking or highway safety, these matters do not address the character and appearance concerns I have found.
9. I have been referred to other developments, in particular to Mayfield Road and properties on Town Lane. However, I do not have full details of these schemes and so cannot be certain that the circumstances are the same. In any event, those that I saw do not change the prevailing character of the area in order to justify the development before me. In any case I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.
10. I acknowledge the appellants' desire to enlarge the family house and that the proposal would result in additional space and quality for the appellant. Nonetheless, these are largely personal matters and do not outweigh the concerns that I have raised above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KA Taylor

INSPECTOR