



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2022

by S D Castle BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/22/3294881

16 Snowdon Crescent, Chester CH4 7PH

- 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 Stephen Carway against the decision of Cheshire West & Chester Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0169/FUL, dated 17 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 09 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side extension, front dormer roof extension and front porch canopy roof. External rendering of existing brickwork walls.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The site is located on the eastern side of Snowdon Crescent, a short cul-de-sac where the houses on the eastern side are broadly laid out in an arc, reflecting the crescent shape of the highway. Due to the curvature of the highway, no 16 is on a wedge-shaped plot, widening from front to rear. The dwelling is set back within its plot behind a driveway, a grassed front garden, and a low boundary wall adjacent to the highway. No 16 Snowdon Crescent is a 2-storey detached dwelling with a distinctive front-sloping cat-slide roof that includes a flat roofed dormer window. Facing materials of the dwelling include brick, render and pantile roof tiles.
4. Whilst Snowdon Crescent has a mix of dwelling styles, towards the end of the crescent there is a distinctive grouping of dwellings, including no 16, that share a similar original design. From my observations, the distinct original design of this grouping makes an important contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene. It is notable that dwellings within the crescent have generally not been significantly extended at 2-storey level to the side, giving the crescent a spacious, harmonious, and verdant feel when combined with the mature landscaping surrounding many of the dwellings.
5. The proposals include a 2-storey side extension reaching the same height as the existing main ridge and extending to the boundary with no 18, a pitched roof front dormer extension, a front porch canopy roof, and the external

rendering of existing brickwork walls. The proposal, therefore, represents a significant remodelling of the existing dwelling. The Council's House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) advises that 2-storey extensions will normally only be supported where, amongst other things, the side elevation is set at least 1m from the side boundary and the roof is lower than the main roof of the dwelling. Given the differing orientations and set backs from the highway of no 16 and no 18, not maintaining a 1m gap to the side boundary would not result in a terracing effect. Nevertheless, extending to the boundary at 2-storey level would result in a harmfully cramped relationship between no 16 and its plot, and between nos 16 and 18. The loss of the gap between no 16 and 18, in combination with no 16 appearing cramped within its plot, would harmfully erode the established spacious and harmonious character of the area.

6. The SPD also advises that front dormers facing a highway are unlikely to be supported unless they are characteristic of other dwellings in the immediate area and that they must be carefully designed to take account of the local vernacular and the characteristics of the existing building. The proposed front dormer extension would represent a dominant addition to the existing dwelling, appearing out of kilter with the wider grouping of similarly designed dwellings at this part of the crescent. Whilst the Council also objects to the rendering of the existing brickwork, I do not share those concerns given render is a common finish within the street scene.
7. I have had regard to the rationale for the proposals set out within the appellant's documents and appreciate that the existing catslide roof and wedge-shaped plot present particular design challenges when considering 2-storey side extensions. I also appreciate that the Council's SPD represents only guidance and that a site-specific approach should always be taken. I have also had regard to the examples of extensions drawn to my attention where the guidance in the SPD may not have been followed. Those examples do not relate to Snowdon Crescent and I have judged this scheme on its own particular merits.
8. Overall, I find the proposals would appear as an awkward and cramped addition to the existing dwelling, detrimental to the harmonious and spacious character of the street scene. The development would harm the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy ENV6 of the Cheshire West and Chester Council Local Plan (Part One), policies DM3 and DM21 of the Cheshire West and Chester Council Local Plan (Part Two), and the SPD. These policies, taken together, amongst other things, require development to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the wider setting. Moreover, the development would be inconsistent with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework as it would not add to the overall quality of the area and would not be sympathetic to the local character.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons above, the appeal is dismissed.

S D Castle

INSPECTOR