



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 16 November 2021

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/21/3274412

14 Anglesey Close, Ellesmere Port CH65 9JH

- 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 Andrew Mayer against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04004/FUL, dated 28 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a side extension above existing garage and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. No concerns are raised by the Council in respect of the single storey rear extension. I agree. Thus, the main issue is the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The dwelling is a semi-detached two storey property on a residential street characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings of a similar type and style. Properties are typically linked by their ground floor garages and have a tight knit but staggered layout. This creates regular gaps between neighbouring dwellings either above the garage or with a narrower gap to the side.
4. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings (SPD) says, in respect of side extensions, that building in gaps between dwellings has the potential to create a 'terracing effect' creating a cramped appearance and giving the impression of a continuous frontage in areas where such development would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the original dwelling and surrounding properties.
5. The proposed side extension would not be set in from the side boundary with 16 Anglesey Close. Therefore, whilst the front elevation would be set back and the roof lower than the host dwelling, the proposal would not meet all the conditions set out in the SPD for a side extension to have a subordinate appearance. The complementary design of the side extension and the proposed use of materials do not alter this or the loss of the gap above the garage.
6. By extending up to the side boundary with No 16, the proposal has the potential to create a terracing effect. Whilst there is no indication that no 16 benefits from planning permission to extend or may wish to, the effect of an

extension to the appeal property at No 16 in an identical or similar manner would be to form a terrace. This would harm the cohesive character of properties in the road which have regular gaps between built form.

7. A similar extension is at 22 Ramsey Road to the rear of the appeal property. I do not know how this extension came to be, whether it benefits from planning permission or what the circumstances were that led to a permission being granted if it was. There are also subtle differences between Ramsey Road and Anglesey Close. Numerous detached properties on Ramsey Road have a similar built form to the side which seem to be part of the original design. Hence, I do not consider No 22 justifies the harmful effect of the appeal scheme.
8. The scale of the proposal may reflect the occupiers needs and enhance their living conditions through additional living accommodation. There would also be no change to the parking and access arrangements.
9. However, neither alters or outweighs my conclusion that the proposed side extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area which would conflict with Policy ENV6 of the Local Plan (Part One) Strategy Policies), Policies DM3 and DM 21 of the Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies and the SPD which jointly seek, among other things, extensions and alterations to existing dwellings to be high quality design that contributes positively to the character of the area, is subordinate to the original dwelling and is sympathetic to the characteristics of the development site and its relationship with its surroundings.

Conclusion

10. Notwithstanding my finding about the single storey rear extension, as this would not be physically separate from the side extension the proposal does not accord with the Development Plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this.
11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR