



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 12 July 2021

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/21/3273497

Melton House, Wrenbury Heath Road, Wrenbury, Nantwich CW5 8FN

- 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 John Haywood against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 20/3875N, dated 7 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension, two storey front extension (hallway), first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension, two storey front extension (hallway) first floor extension at Melton House, Wrenbury Heath Road, Wrenbury, Nantwich, CW5 8FN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/3875N, dated 7 September 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: Location Plan (20-770/LP), Block Plan (20-770/BP), Site Plan (20-770), Existing floor plans and elevations (20-770 Sheet 1), Proposed floor plans and elevations (20-770 Sheet 2), Analysis of additional floor areas and existing floor area lost during construction (20-770 Sheet 3).
 - 3) No development above damp proof course level shall commence until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.
 - 4) All the trees shown on the Site Plan (20-770) shall be protected by strong fencing, the location and type to be previously approved in writing by the local planning authority. The fencing shall be erected in accordance with the approved details before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed within any fenced area, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.

- 5) The details submitted in accordance with condition 3 above shall include a plan showing the position of every tree on the site and on land adjacent to the site that could influence or be affected by the development, including the details of any proposed pruning to those trees. The pruning of the trees shall be carried out as approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Preliminary Matter

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) came into force on 20 July 2021. I have taken this into consideration in determining this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and the area, including trees.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is situated in Wrenbury, in an area identified by the Council as being within the Open Countryside. It is located amongst a group of residential properties, where there is variation in their size and design, but which follow a generally linear pattern of development along Wrenbury Heath Road and South View. They are surrounded by fields which are bounded by hedges, trees and short grass verges, that give the area a spacious, semi-rural character.
5. The proposal seeks a number of additions to the property which has been significantly extended previously. Although the Council have referenced Policy PG 6 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (adopted 2017) (Local Plan) and Policy RES.11 of the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011 (Replacement Local Plan) which state that an extension should not be disproportionate to the original dwelling and an extension subordinate to it, they have also stated that the two storey extension previously made to the original single storey building, has resulted in a more than doubling of the original dwelling.
6. I appreciate the original dwelling is distinguishable from the extensions, but from my site observations, the existing form of the building creates an awkward visual arrangement between the original dwelling and the later additions. The proposal, whilst completely encompassing the original part of the building, would largely be on the existing footprint other than the single storey addition and the limited projection two storey extension. It would also not exceed the height of the existing two storey section of the building. Given the previous two storey extension already dominates the original dwelling, I consider the proposal would consolidate the awkward arrangement of the original dwelling and existing extension to create a more coherent built form.
7. The proposed first floor extension would have a shallow roof, but I was able to see much variance in the roof types and pitches on the nearby buildings. The timber cladding proposed would only be on a limited section of the building and would assimilate the development in its verdant setting amongst trees. In addition, as the balcony would be set back from Wrenbury Heath Road and given the hedge and tree coverage along the boundary, as well as the

balcony's largely glazed form, it would not appear as a prominent addition that would detract from the character of the area.

8. A number of trees are located within or close to the appeal site. Although the Council have stated that arboricultural information has not been provided, the submitted Site Plan identifies the number, location and type of trees closest to the appeal building. This information does not include the projected root protection areas of the trees, but the majority of the proposal is located at first floor level, with the two storey extension proposed to have a limited projection from the existing building and not being in close proximity to any tree. The single storey extension is located in the vicinity of the tree identified as 'T4' on the Site Plan but would replace an existing conservatory. Although it would be wider than the existing conservatory it would replace, it would have a reduced projection and therefore, a greater separation with T4. As a result, based on the submitted information and my site observations, I am satisfied that the trees would not likely be harmed in this respect.
9. The proposal would introduce an additional window serving a first-floor bedroom that would look to the west into the canopy of a Copper Beech tree. This would be a bay window, with a further window serving this same bedroom on the southern elevation. Given this dual aspect, I do not consider that there would be undue pressure to fell the tree and the details of any pruning work could be secured by condition.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host building and the area. As such, it would not conflict with Policies SE 1, SE 5, SD 2 or PG 6 of the Local Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, for development proposals to make a positive contribution to their surroundings and particular attention to design and landscape character so the appearance and distinctiveness of the Cheshire East countryside is preserved and enhanced and trees that provide a significant contribution to the amenity of the surrounding area are protected. It would also not conflict with Policy RES.11 of the Replacement Local Plan or the recently revised Framework which states at paragraph 130, that decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.

Conditions

11. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council, having regard to the six tests set out in the Framework. For the sake of clarity and enforceability, I have amended the conditions as necessary.
12. It is necessary for a condition to require compliance with the approved plans in the interests of clarity. The plans submitted indicate that the development may be finished in rendered blockwork or something contrasting, such as cedar boarding. Given this ambiguity, a condition is necessary requiring the materials to be agreed in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
13. The Council's Heritage & Design – Forestry consultee has set out the need for conditions on tree protection and pruning specification and I consider these to be necessary to ensure the protection of the health of the trees.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other material considerations, the appeal is allowed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR