



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2022

by Nigel Harrison BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/22/3290027

181 Crewe Road, Sandbach, Cheshire, CW11 4PZ

- 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 J Fisher against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref: 21/2605C dated 6 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is a new garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a new garage at 181 Crewe Road, Sandbach, Cheshire, CW11 4PZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref:21/2605C, dated 6 May 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 960-200 Rev A; 960-201; 960-202; and 960-203.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The one main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed garage on the character and appearance of the street scene in Crewe Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a detached property in a residential area comprising a mix of mainly detached and some semi-detached houses set in generous plots and mostly set well-back from the road. The area is suburban in character and to my mind exhibits no strong prevailing character or especially local distinctiveness. There is no uniform building line in this section of Crewe Road due to the different sized plots, the varied size and design of the houses, and the slight curvature of the street.
4. The proposed double garage would be located in the front garden in a position close to the front elevation of the dwelling but set back from the road beyond a section of garden.

5. Although the Council raises no objections to the design of the garage *per se* and agrees that it would appear as subservient to the dwelling, it says the building would be unduly prominent and overbearing in the street scene.
6. However, taking into account the degree of set-back from the highway and the relatively low eaves and ridge heights, I am satisfied that the proposed garage would not appear unacceptably dominant or visually obtrusive in the context of the varied character of the surrounding area. Although the garage would be visible from the highway, this factor in itself is not necessarily harmful and it would be seen against the background of the large existing dwelling behind it.
7. Although I noticed no similar front garden garages in close proximity, other examples can be found in the neighbourhood, and this factor alone is insufficient to render the scheme unacceptable.
8. Policy SD2 of the *Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030* (LP) requires development to contribute positively to an area's character and identity in terms of scale, design, materials, massing and the relationship to neighbouring properties, the street scene, and the wider neighbourhood. Similarly, the *National Planning Policy Framework* says planning decisions should ensure that developments add to the overall quality of the area and are sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built environment.
9. My overall judgement is that the proposed garage would not materially harm the character and appearance of the street scene in Crewe Road. As such. I find no conflict with LP Policy SD2 or those other policies of the development plan to which I have been referred.
10. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council in the light of the advice in the *Government's Planning Practice Guidance*. In addition to the standard time condition, a condition requiring matching materials is needed in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. A condition is needed to secure compliance with the submitted plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
11. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nigel Harrison

INSPECTOR