



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 April 2022

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/W/21/3286918

2 Dorchester Road, Great Sankey, WARRINGTON, WA5 1JZ

- 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 John Sutherland against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/40078, dated 2 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 1no. residential dwelling and single storey side extension to existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As a change of description has been agreed between the parties, I have taken the description of development from the appeal form and the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site occupies a corner plot location on a residential estate, adjacent to the junction of Dorchester Road and Sycamore Lane. No 2 is a semi-detached bungalow with dormer windows on both the front and rear roof slopes. Currently attached to No 2 is an irregular shaped flat roof garage, which would be replaced by a smaller attached flat roof single garage. Currently, fencing comprising concrete posts and timber panels surrounds the side garden area, where a mature hedge faces Sycamore Lane, To the side of the front garden is a tall multi-stemmed tree and mature vegetation.
5. The neighbouring dwellings on the same side of Dorchester Road as the site all face the road. Whereas, the dwellings on the opposite side of this section of Dorchester Road, are located on side streets with their gable ends facing Dorchester Road. During my visit, I noted the layout of the wider estate and visited the areas of Dorchester Road suggested by the appellant, at the Blandford Road and Charminster Close junctions. However, I find that the site possesses different characteristics to these areas.
6. Whilst the side garden is already fenced off and is readily visible from Sycamore Lane, it still respects the siting and location of neighbouring

dwelling, particularly 81 and 83 Sycamore Lane. No 81 occupies a corner location, facing the appeal property and is detached in form, with a front garden, generous in its depth. The front gardens of the properties on this section of Sycamore Lane in the direction away from Dorchester Road towards the head of the cul-de-sac, gradually reduce in depth.

7. No 83 is an end terraced house, which has a front garden of notable depth, which results in the house being set away from the road by an appreciable distance. In both instances, either side of the Dorchester Road junction, there is a strong and established building line on Sycamore Lane. The proposed development would be sited closer to Sycamore Lane than both No's 81 and 83, which will create strident feature within the street scene. This will be more noticeable in the case of No 83 due to its proximity to the site. Whilst there is a stagger in this return building line, it is set back even more from Sycamore Lane. This compounds the ability even further, for the proposed development to be assimilated successfully within the street scene.
8. The appellant has referred to fencing at the site and in the wider area, but I find that this is not comparable to the scale and massing of the scheme. Additionally, the appellant has made reference towards permitted development rights. However, the likelihood and merits of such development are not before this appeal. I have considered the proposed development on its own particular merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.
9. For all of these reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development, would create significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area. Consequently, the proposed development fails to accord with the design, character and appearance aims of Policy QE7, CS1 of the Local Plan Core Strategy 2014, the Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document 2010 and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Planning Balance and Conclusion

10. Whilst I accept the absence of other harm arising from the proposed development, there would also be a minor positive contribution to the Council's supply of homes, and some economic and social benefits through the construction phase and subsequent occupation of the scheme.
11. Nonetheless, these factors do not outweigh my assessment on character and appearance. Given my findings above, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole, and there are no other material considerations that indicate otherwise. It is also at odds with the requirements of the Framework.
12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

W Johnson

INSPECTOR