The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 1 June 2021 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/21/3269940
20 Grassfield Way, Knutsford, WA16 9AF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO).
- The appeal is made by Mr M Baker against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
- The application Ref 20/5206/M, dated 17 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 January 2021.
- The development proposed is "formation of additional storey to an existing bungalow with new windows to the front and rear gables. The property will provide an additional 2 no bedrooms and bathrooms. The existing walls and roof materials will be used in the extended dwelling."

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended was amended on 31 August 2020 to introduce Class AA to Part 1 of Schedule 2, setting out permitted development rights for development consisting of works for the construction of up to two additional storeys on an existing dwellinghouse that consists of two or more storeys, or for one additional storey on an existing single storey dwellinghouse, together with any reasonably necessary engineering operations.

4. Development is permitted under Class AA subject to limitations and conditions and a requirement that the developer applies for prior approval to the local planning authority.

Main Issue

5. In this case the Council raised no concern in respect of the effect of the proposal on the amenity of adjoining premises, on air traffic and defence or on protected views. Accordingly, the main issue is whether prior approval should be granted for the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, with particular regard to its the effect upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. Grassfield Way is characterised by a mix of single and two storey detached dwellings, set back from the road with open boundary frontages. The host dwelling lies within a row of similarly designed bungalows which are uniform in height creating a regular rhythm to the street scene.

7. Whilst the materials and detailing would match that of the existing dwelling, the additional storey would significantly add to the height of the building fundamentally and harmfully altering its character and appearance.

8. The nearby existing two storey dwellings have mainly gable roofs with the ridge parallel to the highway, whereas the bungalows have gable roofs perpendicular to the highway, resulting in a triangular shaped gable frontage. The resultant eaves and roofline, along with the higher gable end, would obtrusively project above that of the neighbouring bungalows. The additional height would reduce the existing uniform appearance of the street-scene resulting in the house being prominent and incongruous.

9. The external appearance of the resultant dwellinghouse would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and is therefore unacceptable. In that regard the proposal would conflict with the general advice contained in Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which amongst other things promotes the creation of high-quality buildings and places.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge the occupiers need for additional living space. Whilst I am sympathetic to this need, I do not consider that it outweighs the harm to the character and appearance of the area I have identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and agree with the recommendation. The appeal is dismissed.

R C Kirby

INSPECTOR