



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 1 June 2021

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/W/21/3268373

The Tithe Barn, Woore Road, Buerton CW3 0DD

- 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 Guy Cramer against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 20/2230N, dated 2 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'raising the height of the existing garage roof to 6300mm, to allow for the introduction of additional internal floor space'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for raising the height of the existing garage roof to 6300mm, to allow for the introduction of additional internal floor space at The Tithe Barn, Woore Road, Buerton, CW3 0DD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/2230N, dated 2 June 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: Site Location Plan (101), Existing Floor Plans (102), Existing Elevations (103), Proposed Floor Plans (104), Proposed Elevations (105) and Proposed Section (A-A) (106), including the materials as shown on plan: Proposed Elevations (105).

Preliminary Matter

2. I have had regard to the publication of the revised National Planning Policy Framework which came into force on 20 July 2021 but nothing within it affects my conclusion.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises of a detached dwelling with a separate garage building set back further from the road than the house. The site is within the open countryside but situated amongst a group of buildings that are set within spacious grounds. The presence of trees and vegetation, as well as views towards surrounding open land, contributes to the area's pleasant semi-rural character.

5. The proposed development would see an increase in the roof height of the detached garage and also include the provision of two side facing dormer windows. The dormers would be set down from the ridge and back from the eaves. They would also be separated from each other and the edges of the roof either side of the respective dormer, such that their scale would be proportionate to the host building. I was able to see the relatively flat land levels in the area at the time of my visit, and the open areas of land to the north and east of the garage. However, in such views, the dormers would be largely set against and seen within the confines of the extended garage roof, whose height increase the Council consider would be acceptable.
6. Reference has been made to the dormers being seen as overtly domestic additions, but I do not consider this would be harmful in a location where the appeal garage is set amongst other buildings. Many of these buildings have differing forms and styles and the addition of the dormers with a relatively simple appearance would not appear as discordant or alien features in this context. The extended garage building, whose position and footprint remains unchanged, other than the external staircase, would retain the spacious appearance of the appeal site and it would not therefore give rise to harm to the semi-rural characteristics of the area.
7. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the host building or the area. As such, it would not conflict with Policies SE 1 or PG 6 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (adopted 2017), which seek, amongst other matters, for development proposals to make a positive contribution to their surroundings. It would also not conflict with RES.11 of the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011 or the Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (2008), which require, amongst other matters, development within the curtilage of a dwelling to respect the setting, design, scale, form and materials of the original dwelling.

Conditions

8. The Council have suggested a number of conditions. I have imposed the standard condition relating to the commencement of development. It is also necessary for a condition to require compliance with the approved plans as well as this condition requiring the materials to be in accordance with those specified. I have amended the wording of the suggested conditions in the interests of conciseness.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR