



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022

by David Jones BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/W/21/3283647

123-127 Crewe Road, Haslington, CW1 5RG

- 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 D Beecroft against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 21/2531N, dated 30 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is the part demolition of existing buildings, erection of part one and part two storey rear extension, external alterations to principal elevation and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to 123, 125 and 127 Crewe Road which form two residential dwellings, one encompassing Nos 123 and 125 with No 127 acting as a separate independent dwelling. The properties are of red brick construction with tiled roofs and have a traditional, modest, cottage style appearance. Single storey extensions have previously been added to the rear. The area has a relatively consistent traditional residential character with dwellings typically of modest proportions.
4. The proposal seeks the demolition of the existing single storey rear extensions, with the subsequent erection of a part one and part two storey extension to the rear. It is also proposed that the internal layout of the properties will be reconfigured so to amalgamate the current two dwellings into one. The proposed extension would extend to over 13 metres in length from the rear elevation of the original property and would also contain four dormer windows at first floor level on the south facing elevation, as well as a substantial flat roofed area.
5. Notwithstanding the overall size of the plot which could accommodate an extension of this size, and that the extension would not exceed the overall height of the adjacent convenience store, I find that the proposal would represent a disproportionate and substantial extension which would overwhelm the host property in terms of its size and scale.

6. I also find that by virtue of its size, scale and design the proposed rear extension would not relate well to or complement the more modest and traditional character and appearance of the existing property or area. The combination of its significant scale along with its design which includes varying roof pitches and styles, would result in the extension competing visually with the host property, adversely affecting its character and appearance.
7. Although the proposal would be partially obscured from external views by virtue of it being located to the rear and having a ridge height no higher than the ridge of the existing property, the development would still be visible from the highway as you approach from the south. Views of the southern elevation of the proposal would be apparent within the street scene which due to its design, orientation, and scale would represent an incongruous feature at odds with the predominately traditional character of the area.
8. In addition, the proposed north elevation of the extension, which would face onto the alleyway running between the appeal site and the adjacent convenience store, would be blank and have an eaves height significantly higher than the existing eaves. This would result in a large expansive solid wall that I consider would represent a substantial and overly dominant feature for users of the alleyway and adjacent car park.
9. I acknowledge that the existing rear extensions at the property are somewhat dated and of little architectural merit. However, these extensions are very much subordinate in scale, relate better to the host property, and have little if any impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
10. I also acknowledge that the proposal would bring about benefits in respect of providing additional more useable space within the property for its occupiers, and through minor improvements and alterations to its front elevation. These benefits however do not outweigh the harm that I have identified, and there is no indication that any façade improvements, or other benefits of the scheme, are entirely reliant on the particular scheme before me.
11. I therefore conclude that the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policies SD1, SD2 and SE1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (adopted July 2017) (LP), Saved Policy RES. 11 of the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan (adopted February 2005) (RLP), and guidance contained within the 'Extensions and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document' (2008). These policies, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that developments contribute positively to an areas character, and respect the design, scale and form of the original property.

Other Matters

12. I have given careful consideration to the appellant's concerns regarding anti-social behaviour, as well as noise, light and air pollution issues that they explain is associated with the convenience store, its car park and the adjacent alleyway. Although reference is made to complaints being lodged with the Council in respect of these matters, no specific details have been provided. Any such incidents would of course be regrettable, however the scheme before me is not necessarily the sole means of achieving a better inter-relationship between the neighbouring uses. I would also note that there are separate controls to address noise and anti-social behaviour. I do not consider that

these concerns outweigh the harm identified or provide sufficient justification for allowing the appeal proposal.

13. The appellant has also drawn reference to planning permissions which have been granted by the Council for extensions at two other dwellings. Whilst I do not have the specific details of the cases referred to, it is noted that neither of the examples cited are in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site nor is it immediately apparent whether there are any similarities between the schemes. In any case, I do not consider that their presence would justify the harm which I have identified would be caused by the appeal proposal.
14. Comments in support of the proposal were received from two members of the public, including views that the proposal was sympathetic and would enhance the existing dwelling. However, whilst I have given these comments due consideration, for the reasons set out above I have reached an alternative conclusion and found that the development would result in harm being caused to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Conclusion

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

David Jones

INSPECTOR