



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2022

by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 JANUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/21/3287691
10 Meadowcroft Saughall Chester CH1 6EU

- 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 Alistair Watts of Northern Bright Limited against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01896/FUL, dated 30 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2021.
 - The development is render to front elevation and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for render to the front elevation and rear extensions at 10 Meadowcroft Saughall Chester CH1 6EU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01896/FUL, dated 30 April 2021, and the plan submitted with it.

Procedural Matter

2. The property, the subject of the appeal, has already been rendered. Accordingly I have determined the appeal on this basis. I have deleted the word “retrospective” from the description of the development as this is not an act of development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, No 10 Meadowcroft (No 10) is a bungalow, set within a small residential cul de sac of other bungalows, accessed from Newcroft, a similar single storey development. There are several examples of partially rendered properties on Newcroft, including one which is fully rendered. Whilst brick is the dominant external material of properties on both streets, there is a variety of different facades, window openings, timber and UPVC doors and windows. There is therefore some diversity in terms of the overall appearance of dwellings within the streetscene.
5. The render, together with the other alterations to the property, changes the appearance of No 10, but in itself this does not automatically equate to harm.

Notwithstanding the contrast to the new grey window frames, the render is not an unattractive finish to the renovated bungalow. A stone cladding panel to the front, which is a common feature to the bungalows in this part of the streetscene, is retained. In the majority of views of No 10 approaching along Meadowcroft, the front elevation is seen in the context of large picture UPVC windows and white garage doors of neighbouring properties. In addition, it is partially screened due to its set back position and existing vegetation on the front boundary. Whilst the overall appearance of No 10 is a contrast to the traditional brickwork materials seen elsewhere on Meadowcroft, it does not over dominate or significantly impact on the overall appearance of the cul-de-sac.

6. I appreciate that the larger rear extension can be viewed from limited locations within the cul de sac. Notwithstanding the size of this extension, only that part of the render above the boundary fence can be viewed and it is seen in the context of the brick wall of the side elevation. As such it reflects the hybrid nature of render and brick seen elsewhere on the development as a whole and is not an incongruous feature in the streetscene.
7. I note the Council's concern that the development could set a precedent for the rendering of other properties in the area. Each application and any appeal must be determined on its individual merits. In this case, the circumstances outlined above are such that I consider it would be unlikely to lead to harmful development elsewhere in the vicinity.
8. Accordingly, I conclude that the render does not result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area and as such does not conflict with the Cheshire West and Chester Council Local Plan (Part One) Policy ENV6 and the Cheshire West and Chester Council Local Plan (Part Two) Policies DM3 and DM21 which require, amongst other things, development to respect local character and distinctiveness and to be in keeping with the original dwelling and wider setting. I note that the normal expectation within the Cheshire West and Chester Council Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings (SPD) is for materials to match the existing building. Given the specific circumstances of the appeal site as detailed above, I conclude that the development complies with the overall aims of the SPD which seeks to ensure a high level of visual amenity.

Other Matters

9. I note that the Council does not express any concerns as to the development giving rise to any impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, nor any impact on highway safety. I have no reason to disagree with these assessments.

Conditions

10. As the development has taken place, no conditions are necessary.

Conclusion

11. Accordingly, for the reasons explained and having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR