



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2022

by M Shrigley BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21ST February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/21/3285947

9 Birch Fold, Allstock, Northwich CW4 8NR

- 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 Sheard against the decision of Cheshire West & Chester Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00207/FUL, dated 15 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on: (i) the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling; and (ii) neighbouring living conditions.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. At my site visit I could see that the appeal dwelling is a modestly proportioned semi-detached property (linked by an attached garage) situated at the head of a cul de sac. The appearance of the property entails a simple dual pitch roof and main facade design. It shares the uniform architectural details and matching proportions of other nearby dwellings in the vicinity as a noticeable part of its overall character.
4. I disagree that the scale of the proposed extensions would be appropriate relative to the existing proportions of the main dwelling house. The height, bulk and mass of the new extensions combined would be out of keeping with the dwelling's modest size and form. The additions would appear overly dominant and would sit awkwardly against its existing simple elevations and dual pitched main roof profile.
5. I acknowledge that the full extent of the changes would not be seen from roadside vantages. Even so, the side extension component lacks a substantial setback or a lower roof ridge height and would be prominent. Moreover, my assessment applies to the full extent of the property when applying current design policy. The appeal scheme would fail to successfully integrate with the dwelling's character when considered as a whole. Although matching external

facing materials would be able to be utilised, and the rear garden area is substantial those factors do not lessen the detriment which would arise.

6. Thus, I find that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling. It would conflict with Policy DM 21 of the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies (CWCLP2), and the aims of the Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Outbuildings January 2021 (SPDHEO) which combined seek to encourage good design. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which replicates that aim.

Living conditions

7. Sunlight study drawings have been submitted to further the appellants' case. I accept that there would be adequate resultant light levels to the habitable rooms of the adjoining semi given the single storey component proposed.
8. That said, the scale of the appeal development would still lead to an overly dominant two storey, built structure very close to a shared boundary. There would be some overshadowing of neighbouring garden land associated to it. The proximity, height, bulk, and mass of the appeal development would be a noticeable and oppressive physical change which would erode from the quality of neighbouring living conditions. It would be imposing and overbearing.
9. Accordingly, the proposed development, by reason of its scale, massing and subsequent overbearing qualities would adversely impact the living conditions of neighbouring residents. It would conflict with Policy DM21 of the CWCLP2 and the aims of the SPDHEO which both seek to protect neighbouring living conditions from harm as well as similar aims contained within the Framework.

Other Matters

10. I have carefully considered the appellants' reasons for extending the property in order to provide increased family accommodation and to support wellbeing interests. The associated advantages of allowing local building work to take place are also referred to. But there is nothing to suggest increased accommodation could not be achieved without resulting in harm.
11. Furthermore, I acknowledge the extensions granted planning permission in 2009 (LPA reference 09/00813/FUL) referred to by the main parties. However, the measurements provided in the appellants' statement indicate a materially larger extension is currently subject to this appeal, with different impacts. Local planning policies are referenced in the evidence to have evolved since that decision and there have been changes to planning policy at a national level. There is also no case made for an historic consent capable of being built out. Therefore, bringing all of those points together there is nothing compelling which leads me to a different conclusion.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons the appeal does not succeed.

M Shrigley

INSPECTOR

