



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2021

by David Jones BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/21/3282438

32 Green Lane, Poulton-With-Fearnhead, Warrington WA1 4JA

- 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 C Davies against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/38866, dated 3 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is part single storey and part two storey extension to side and rear to replace garage and conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 32 Green Lane is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the corner of Green Lane and Mead Road in a predominately residential area. The property is of brick construction with a hipped tile roof and has a single storey garage with parapet wall attached to the side elevation. The immediately surrounding properties to the north and north west of the appeal site are also semi-detached dwellings which sit within relatively spacious plots.
4. It is proposed to erect a two storey side extension in place of the existing single storey garage, and a single storey rear extension which would replace an existing modest conservatory. The two extensions would be linked with the roof slope of the single storey rear extension continuing along the rear elevation of the two storey extension, creating a covered outside area.
5. The two storey side extension would be 4 metres wide, with the width of the existing dwellinghouse being approximately 6 metres wide. Consequently, the width of the two storey side extension would exceed 50% of the width of the host dwelling and therefore be in conflict with the Council's 'House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document' (adopted June 2021) (SPD).
6. Despite the first floor of the two storey element being set back from the front elevation, by virtue of its size and scale, I find that the development would be overly dominant and not subservient to the host dwelling. Furthermore, the two storey extension would unbalance the symmetry with the adjoining

- property causing harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.
7. Given the properties location on the corner of Green Lane and Mead Road, the proposed two storey extension would also take up a prominent and exposed position within the street scene. The extension would extend up to virtually the boundary of the property with Mead Road, which as a result of its overall width and height would result in an overbearing and overly dominant form of development.
 8. Mead Road which runs to the side of No 32 is a small residential cul-de-sac that serves a handful of properties. The first properties along Mead Road and those immediately adjacent to the appeal property are three terraced cottage style dwellings. Despite the single storey garage with parapet roof which is attached to No 32 projecting forward of their building line, these properties are visible from Green Lane.
 9. However, given that the proposed side extension would be two storey and wider than the existing garage and therefore protrude further beyond the building line of properties on Mead Road, the development would largely screen these properties from views from Green Lane and erode the openness and spacious feel that exists. This would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
 10. I agree with the Council that the single storey rear extension would be acceptable and would not result in any harm being caused to either the character and appearance of the host dwelling or wider area. However, as it is physically attached to the two storey side extension it is not severable and I am unable to issue a split decision.
 11. Notwithstanding my finding regarding the single storey rear extension, I conclude that the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policy QE7 of the Warrington Borough Council Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted July 2014) and the SPD which, amongst other things seeks to ensure developments are subordinate in scale and do not over dominate the original house, and are of good design so to reinforce local distinctiveness and enhance the character and appearance.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations which would outweigh this finding. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

David Jones

INSPECTOR