



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2021 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/21/3271394

17 Station Lane, Mickle Trafford, Chester CH2 4EH

- 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 Steven Long against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04256/FUL, dated 13 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of tile hanging with render.
-

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.

Procedural Matter

3. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration in my decision-making, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal dwelling is of similar character and appearance to the adjacent two storey properties on either side. All feature dark hanging tiles and/or timber cladding to the first floor, which is a key characteristic feature to properties in this locality, and contributes to a consistent visual appearance in the immediate street scene.

6. The proposed development involves the loss of the hanging tiles and inclusion of render to the upper floor. It would therefore remove a key characteristic of the original design of the host property and those in the wider area. Furthermore, the proposed render to the upper floor would be highly prominent and would appear as a stark and incongruous alteration that fails to reflect the design of properties in this locality.
7. I observed that there were other properties along Station Lane with an element of render. Some are a considerable distance from the appeal site and are read in a different context to the appeal property. It is however acknowledged that the bungalows opposite the appeal site have a part render finish, although this tends to be below eaves level with the characteristic hanging tile/cladding feature present above. As such, the rendered sections in those examples represents a minor feature that is not highly prominent in the wider street scene.
8. The appellant suggests that the hanging tiles are in a diminishing condition and the property suffers from poor insulation. I did not observe any obvious external concerns with regard to their condition, however, be that as it may, there is no convincing evidence before me to indicate that the necessary improvements cannot be achieved with a more appropriate material.
9. Accordingly, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. It would therefore conflict with Policy ENV6 of the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (the 'CWCLP') (Part One) Strategic Policies and Policies DM3 and DM21 of the CWCLP (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies. Collectively, these policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that developments are in keeping with and respect the character and appearance of the original dwelling and surrounding properties.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Hannah Ellison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR