



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: 20 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/21/3281106

12 Warren Road, Appleton, Warrington WA4 5AG

- 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 & Mrs Tony & Ellie Berryman against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/39237, dated 22 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is part single storey part two-storey side and rear extension and front porch extension.
-

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. 12 Warren Road is a detached red brick dwelling with tall curved bay windows and an arched entrance doorway. A single storey garage with a mono pitched roof is attached to the west elevation. The property has previously been extended including a first floor side extension on the eastern elevation and a single storey rear extension.
4. The appeal property is located within a residential area in south Warrington comprising predominantly detached and semi detached dwellings. The property itself, along with others in the immediate vicinity, dates from around the immediate post war period. Whilst there is no overall uniformity in terms of their design or features, and despite many of these dwellings having been extended or altered, overall the properties have retained their traditional brick built form.
5. The proposed development seeks the demolition of the existing attached single storey garage and the subsequent erection of a two storey side extension with rear balcony, the remodelling of the existing single storey rear extension and the erection of a front porch. The ground floor of the proposed development would be rendered, with the first floor level and roof of the two storey element clad with oak coloured vertical boarding.
6. The proposal is essentially a re-submission of a previously submitted planning application (Ref 2020/38096) which was refused by the Council on the 19 February 2021. The only change between the previous planning application and

the appeal proposal is the roof of the two storey side extension has been changed from a flat roof to a pitched roof.

7. Whilst I consider that the pitched roof design and the scale and size of the proposed two storey side extension to be acceptable, I find that by virtue of the materials the development would constitute an unsympathetic form of development which would be at odds the host property.
8. Although the proposed two storey side extension would not be visible from a particularly wide vista, the development and in particular its roof would come into view when approaching from the west. Its prominence would increase gradually as you approach with more of the development becoming visible until it would be within full view and immediately apparent when outside the property.
9. The use of oak coloured vertical boarding on the first floor elevations and roof of the two storey side extension would not be in keeping or harmonise with the traditional brick built form of the host dwelling, and would be immediately noticeable when experiencing views of the property. Although the boarding would only cover a small percentage of the total surface area of the front elevation, it would also extend to the roof further adding to its effect on both the host dwelling and the wider street scene. Therefore, rather than assisting in making the extension a subservient element to the host dwelling, I find that the use of the boarding would result in the extension being a visually dominant feature which would cause harm to the host dwelling.
10. Furthermore, whilst some properties in the immediate locality have render applied at first floor level the area retains a brick built character and appearance. Consequently, due to the oak coloured vertical boarding, the proposed two storey side extension would appear an alien feature when viewed amongst the traditional red brick with tiled roofed dwellings it would sit. As such I consider that the development would represent an incongruous feature that would harm the character and appearance of the area.
11. With regards to the proposed balcony, the Council has not raised any concerns regarding any potential loss of privacy or any other harm being caused to the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties. Following my site visit I am satisfied that this is the case, and that the balcony would not result in any harm being caused to the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties or to the character and appearance of the area.
12. Regarding the single storey rear extension and the proposed front porch, I am satisfied that their design, size and siting are such that they would not result in harm being caused to the character and appearance of the area. The Council has also raised no objections to these aspects of the proposal in their decision notice or delegated report.
13. Notwithstanding my conclusions regarding the proposed balcony, single storey rear extension and front porch, 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 Council's House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (adopted June 2021) which, amongst other things seeks to ensure developments harmonise visually with existing dwellings, are of appropriate scale and

materials, and are designed so to reinforce local distinctiveness and enhance the character and appearance.

14. The Council has also referred to Local Plan Policy QE6, which primarily relates to development not having an adverse impact on the amenity of future occupiers or those occupying adjoining or nearby properties. It is a shared view between the parties that the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties, and from my site visit I found no evidence to disagree with this view. Consequently, I do not consider there to be any conflict with Policy QE6.

Conclusion

15. 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