



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2021

by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/21/3276684

13 Hill Cliffe Road, Walton, Warrington, WA4 6PA

- 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 P Williams against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/38740, dated 16 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension above the detached garage and a two storey extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. In June 2021, after the submission of the appeal, the Council adopted a new *House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD). As a result, I sought the views of both main parties regarding this. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the national and local policies as adopted at the present time.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling located on the corner of Hill Cliffe Road and Rutland Avenue. The surrounding area is residential in nature comprising large semi-detached and detached houses and bungalows that follow strong building lines. Good sized front gardens and corner plots contribute to the area having an open and spacious character. The property currently has a detached garage located to the side of the house, close to the boundary wall on Rutland Avenue.
5. The house, which is brick at ground floor and rendered at first floor level, has many attractive design features. Some of these, such as brick quoins, ornate ridge tiles and the feature seam between the brick and render elements, are reflected in the existing garage which, although only single storey, is also partially brick and partially rendered.
6. The appeal scheme would significantly increase the height of the garage as well as its size and would introduce windows on the upper floor on three elevations.

Nevertheless, it would still remain subservient to the dwelling. However, whilst the design has sought to reflect architectural features in the host property the ratio of render to brick work is out of proportion, and serves to emphasise the height of the building. Moreover, whilst the decorative seam on the main house marks the change from brick to render, although at the same level on the proposed garage, it would be in the middle of the rendered section and so would appear incongruous. The fact that the window on the front elevation would puncture this feature would make this a discordant element and out of character with the dwelling. In the light of this, the proposal would not be sympathetic to the host dwelling.

7. The position of the existing garage is such that it is already located in front of the building line along Rutland Avenue. However, the boundary wall and vegetation both in gardens and along the street, mean visibility of it is limited. However, the significant increase in height that would result from the appeal scheme, would make it a much more prominent feature in the street scene of Rutland Avenue. This would highlight the incongruity of its position in relation to the building line of this road in a way not seen with the current garage. This would particularly be the case in winter when the screening impact of the vegetation is much reduced.
8. In addition, due to its close proximity to boundary with Rutland Avenue, the increase in the mass and bulk of the garage would make it an overly dominant feature and would serve to erode the spaciousness of the plot and the contribution it makes to the open character of the area.
9. All in all, the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would conflict with policies QE6 and QE7 of the Warrington Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted July 2014) which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that developments do not have an unacceptable impact on the area, reinforce local distinctiveness and harmonise with existing buildings.
10. I note the desire of the appellant to create additional space for his family. However, personal circumstances rarely outweigh more general planning considerations and it is likely that the proposal would remain long after the current personal circumstances cease to be material.
11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR