

Appeal Decision

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

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/21/3274102

28 Canadian Avenue, Hoole, Chester CH2 3HH

- 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 Mrs Suzanne Roderick against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref 20/03335/FUL, dated 9 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

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. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework. Both main parties were provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. Neither the appellant nor the Council have made any submissions.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling of similar appearance to the surrounding pairs of properties along Canadian Avenue. Despite existing alterations, the original character of the host dwelling and its hipped roof form is readily discernible.
6. The proposal would be constructed above the existing single storey extension and its location would fall short of the recommended set-in distance of the Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings (January 2021) (the SPD). However, the shortfall would be only limited and given the lack of built development to the side of the neighbouring property, I consider that the set-in proposed is acceptable in this instance.

7. However, to achieve a subordinate appearance, the SPD also advises that the front elevation of the first floor should be set back at least one metre from the main part of the front wall of the house. This proposal fails to meet this set back by a considerable amount. The proposal's siting and its scale and mass, when read in combination with the existing side extension, would cause it to appear as an overly dominant two storey side extension that would lack subservience to the host dwelling. Given its bulk and siting, it would be an incongruous feature that would be readily apparent from the street scene.
8. Furthermore, the pitch of the proposed roof would fail to reflect or integrate well with the roof form of the host dwelling as it would be noticeably shallower. It would be visually unattractive and would further exacerbate the prominence of the proposal.
9. Accordingly, due to its siting and design, the proposed development would harm 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 Council Local Plan (Part One) Strategic Policies, Policies DM3 and DM21 of the Cheshire West and Chester Council Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies and the guidance within the SPD. Collectively these policies and guidance seek to ensure that developments respect the scale, character and appearance of the property and local area and are subordinate to the main building.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

H Ellison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and I agree with the recommendation. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR