
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 April 2022

by D Hartley BA (Hons) MTP MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/22/3295561

Holly Lodge, 52 Jacksons Edge Road, Disley SK12 2JR

- 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 Nicola and Graham Clark against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 21/3107M, dated 7 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage and home office.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property falls within Jacksons Edge Road which comprises a number of large and predominantly detached dwellings set within very spacious plots. While the dwellings are not identical in appearance, they are all set well back from the main road giving a sense of openness to the frontage of the properties when seen by passers-by. This, coupled with the mature front boundary vegetation and the tree lined street, adds positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. I acknowledge that the dwellings do not each follow a precise building line when seen from Jacksons Edge Road. However, as the majority of buildings within each of the plots, including the frontage garages at Nos 42 and 44 Jacksons Edge Road, are set well back from the road, there is a general uniformity to the pattern and position of built form in this locality. The dwellings are visible from the street-scene, albeit framed and softened by open and green frontage spaces.
5. In the context of the above, the proposed garage and home office would be positioned in very close proximity to the boundary with Jacksons Edge Road. The building would have two floors and while the eaves height of the building would be relatively low at about 2.4 metres, it would nonetheless be a tall structure with a ridge height of approximately 6.2 metres. Furthermore, the building would occupy about half of the width of the frontage of the appeal site.

6. On my site visit, I was able to see a timber outbuilding positioned in a similar location to the appeal development. This outbuilding is considerably lower in height than the proposed garage/home office and is screened from public view owing to the roadside hedge. In contrast, the roadside hedge would not screen the proposed development which would be imposing when viewed from Jacksons Edge Road.
7. Owing to the position, height and size of the building, I therefore find that it would appear unacceptably prominent and dominant when viewed from the street-scene. It would harmfully detract from the general uniformity of open and green space that exists to the front of each of the dwellings in the street. Furthermore, given the position, size and height of the building, it would not appear subordinate in scale to the main dwelling on the site. It would dominate the existing dwelling particularly when viewed from Jacksons Edge Road: indeed, a large proportion of the front of the existing dwelling would no longer be visible and instead would be obscured from view by a tall and wide garage/home office roof. The impact would be that of a bland and uncharacteristic form of development when seen from the main road.
8. I do acknowledge that there are garages that project forward of the principal elevations at Nos 42 and 44 Jacksons Edge Road. However, these garages are positioned tight up against each dwelling, are set well back from the main road, and to the passer-by are not, in relative terms, appreciated as dominant or out of scale additions when seen in the context of the wider street-scene. The existence of these garages does not therefore alter or outweigh my finding that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not accord with the design, character and appearance requirements of policies SD2 and SE1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2017; saved policy DC2 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan 2004; policy BE2 of the Disley Neighbourhood Plan 2018, and chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that the proposal would provide enclosed secure parking on the site. However, this has to be weighed against the significant harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area if the appeal were to be allowed. This is not a matter that alters or outweighs my conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development would not accord with the development plan for the area taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

D Hartley

INSPECTOR