



---

## Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 15 June 2021

**by J Williamson BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 23 June 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/21/3271980**

**100 Summertrees Road, Great Sutton, Cheshire CH66 2RP**

- 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 Kevin West against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
  - The application Ref 20/04027/FUL, dated 10 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 March 2021.
  - The development is described as: proposed front porch, side lounge room with store at ground floor, with bedroom, dressing room and en-suite to the first floor.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for two-storey side/rear extension, at 100 Summertrees Road, Great Sutton, Cheshire CH66 2RP, in accordance with the terms of the application and 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 revised, unnumbered, approved plans, which do not include the front porch extension.
  - 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.
  - 4) Prior to the extension hereby approved being first used, space for 2 No. cars to be suitably parked within the site shall be created and made available for use. The spaces shall be retained thereafter without impediment to their designated use.

### Preliminary Matters

2. I note that revised plans were submitted to the Council during the planning application process, which removed the proposed single-storey front porch extension from the proposal. My decision is based on the revised plans. Because of the changes, the description of proposed development also changed from that on the original application form. The Council (on its Decision Notice) and the appellant (on their appeal form) have both described the proposal as a two-storey side extension. As the proposed extension projects beyond the original rear elevation of the property, I consider the proposal includes an extension to the rear. I have therefore described the proposal as a two-storey

side/rear extension in the decision, as I consider this more accurately describes the proposal. I have made my decision on this basis.

### **Main Issue**

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the property and the area.

### **Reasons**

4. The site is comprised of a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling with garden to the rear and a hard-standing area to the front. The property has been extended at ground-floor level to the rear, projecting a little beyond its side elevation. There is also a canopy on the side, with timber gates at the front, sited between the south-western facing side elevation of the dwelling and a single-storey side garage extension on the neighbouring property, number 98; the canopy, gates and garage extension all extend to the side boundary between the properties.
5. The area is residential, and the immediate surrounding area is characterised by two-storey, semi-detached dwellings. Although the dwellings on sections of the streets, including the section comprising 102-78 Summertrees Road, were originally designed as a row of matching semi-detached dwellings, many of the properties have been extended and altered over time such that they are no longer identical. Several have added porches to the front; many have added single-storey extensions to the side, and several have two-storey side extensions. Additionally, there was originally, and still is, a variation in the designs of the semi-detached properties in the area. Thus, some have gable ends, others have hipped roofs; some have flat front elevations, and others have front bay windows extending over both floor levels. Consequently, the original uniformity between rows of properties has been eroded. However, despite the extensions and alterations that have occurred, the properties do still read as semi-detached dwellings.
6. I acknowledge that the proposal would extend up to the side boundary with number 98, thereby closing the gap between the 2 properties. However, taking account of the context described above and the wording of key relevant policies and supplementary guidance, as the first-floor element would be set-back from the front elevation close to 1 m, the roof ridge and front roof slope would be lower than the existing and integrate well with it, and a gap over 2 m wide would still be retained between the appeal property and number 98 at first-floor level, I consider the proposed development would respect the design of the host property, appear subordinate to it and would not create a terracing effect. As such, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the host property or the area.
7. I therefore consider that the proposal would accord with policies ENV 6 of the Local Plan (Part One), DM 3 and DM 21 of the Local Plan (Part Two) and guidance in the Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings (January 2021), (SPD). Collectively, and among other things, these policies and guidance seek to ensure new development is of high-quality design, which respects and protects the character and appearance of the site, surrounding buildings, and the wider area. I note that the proposal would not be 1 m from the side boundary with number 78, as advised in the SPD. However, the SPD is guidance as well as recognising that not all scenarios

can be addressed within the guidance and that ultimately each case must be assessed on its merits. I consider the proposal satisfies the broad aims and objectives of both the policies referred to and the guidance in the SPD.

### **Other Matters**

8. I note that concerns have been raised by the existing occupants of the property to the rear of the site, number 2 Everest Close, regarding loss of light and privacy. I acknowledge that there would be some change in the extent of light received at number 2 and the extent of overlooking would also change as a result of the proposal. However, given the general orientation of each of the properties, the way they are orientated towards each other, the existing outbuildings at the side and rear of number 2, the positioning of existing windows on number 2 and the rooms they serve and the distance between the properties, I consider that the degree of change in both light and privacy levels would not be of an extent that should result in planning permission being withheld.

### **Conditions**

9. I have attached a condition specifying the plans for the avoidance of doubt, as revised plans were submitted. I have attached a condition regarding materials, to protect the character and appearance of the area; and I have attached a condition requiring on-site parking spaces to be provided, taking account of the on-street parking available in the area and guidance in the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (May 2017), in the interest of highway safety.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

*J Williamson*

INSPECTOR