



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 1 June 2021

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/21/3271375

The Stables, Bradwall Road, Bradwall, Sandbach, CW11 1RG

- 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 Jon Allday against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
- The application Ref 20/5486C, dated 4 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2021.
- The development proposed is a single storey extension to rear elevation.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension to rear elevation at The Stables, Bradwall Road, Bradwall, Sandbach, CW11 1RG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/5486C, dated 4 December 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: Key Location Plan (Drg No:1 BR 001 Mod. A), Existing Block Plan & Site Plan (Drg No:1 BR 002 Mod. A), Existing Plans, Elevations & Section (Drg No:1 BR 003 Mod. A), Proposed Plans, Elevations & Section (Drg No:1 BR 004 Mod. A) and Proposed Block Plan (Drg No:1 BR 005 Mod. A).
 - 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one part of a former barn which has been converted to a number of dwellings. The dwellings are arranged in an L-shaped layout and front onto a courtyard area that is accessed from Bradwall Road. The traditional form of this group of buildings, as well as the presence of open fields and agricultural land around them, gives the area a spacious, rural character.
4. The proposed extension would be situated on the western elevation of the appeal building. It would project from its existing simple shaped layout but would have a single storey form and be of a limited width. I do not therefore consider that it would unduly alter the L-shaped form of these buildings which are two storeys high. The original form of the converted agricultural building

would still be evident, particularly given the length of the western elevation and the addition of the modest proposal would not unduly clutter the western side of the building against which it would be set.

5. I appreciate that the original conversion was designed to have an agricultural appearance and reference has been made to a number of features, such as the minimal rooflights that were incorporated to retain the rural, agricultural character of the former barn. The proposed development however, apart from one window opening, would not affect any existing architectural features of the appeal building. Furthermore, in terms of the design of the proposal, the Council acknowledge its fenestration would be simple and it would respect the form of the host building. I also consider that its overall design, with a dual pitched roof, materials matched to the existing building along with brick detailing to the gable would reflect the design of the host building.
6. The proposal may be seen from Bradwall Road, but any such views would, from my site observations, be from limited vantage points given the distance the proposed extension is from the road and the intervening hedges that are broadly situated along the boundary to the road. The proposed extension would not therefore unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the existing building or the open, rural character of the area.
7. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the host building or the area. As such, it would not conflict with Policies SE 1 or SD 2 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy, which seek, amongst other matters, for development proposals to make a positive contribution to their surroundings. It would also not conflict with Policy H16 of the Congleton Borough Local Plan First Review, the Congleton Borough Council Supplementary Planning Document No. 7 Rural Development or the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek to ensure, amongst other matters, that the proposed extension is well designed having due regard to the existing dwelling.

Other Considerations

8. My attention has been drawn to the planning history of the appeal site and reference has also been made to a conservatory on an adjoining dwelling. In addition, an extract of an appeal decision¹ on another site has been provided. Proposals for development are determined with regard to the particular circumstances of each individual case and, as such, direct parallels are not easily drawn. Limited further details have been set out, but from the information provided, it is clear there were differences between the referenced appeal and this appeal development. That appeal proposed bi-folding doors and there were also other concerns identified in the appeal decision, such as in relation to the shallower pitch of the roof compared to the existing dwelling. I can confirm that I have considered this appeal case on its own merits.

Conditions

9. The Council have suggested a number of conditions. I have imposed the standard condition relating to the commencement of development. It is also necessary for a condition to require compliance with the approved plans as well

¹ Ref: APP/R0660/D/19/3239639

as a condition requiring matching materials to the existing building in the interests of character and appearance.

Conclusion

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

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR