



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2022 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by R Sabu BA(Hons), MA, BArch, PgDip, RIBA, ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/22/3297259

Oversley Lodge Cottage, Altrincham Road, Styal SK9 4LJ

- 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 Mrs Sarah Parker against the decision of Cheshire East Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/3415M, dated 23 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension at Oversley Lodge Cottage, Altrincham Road, Styal SK9 4LJ in accordance with the terms of the application 21/3415M, dated 23 June 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: Location and Block Plan drawing no. 930.000 Revision A; Proposed Ground Floor Plan and Mezzanine Above drawing no. 930.003 Revision A; and Proposed Elevations drawing no. 930.004 Revision A.
 - 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 building.
 - 4) The material and colour of any rainwater goods to be installed on the development shall be cast metal and painted black.
 - 5) All new windows and external doors shall be set behind a reveal to match the existing fenestration.
 - 6) All brickwork to the external elevations of the proposed development shall be constructed with bonding to match the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.
-

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property one of a small group of dwellings which resulted from a barn conversion. The barn properties have been finished in brick with a slate roof, with brick detailing on the walls and window headers. Whilst the windows are mostly modest in size, the adjoining property 'The Coach House' has a large two-storey window and door to the front and rear elevations. Overall, the properties have a well-designed, distinctive and cohesive appearance which contributes positively to the character of the area.
5. The proposed extension would be subservient to the existing property as it would be set back from the existing front elevation with the roof set down from the current ridge line, and it would not project excessively to the side. The roof form would echo that of the existing roof, the exterior brickwork would match the detailing of the existing property, and the new front windows would match the existing fenestration detailing.
6. While it would not exactly mirror the design of the existing two-storey windows at 'The Coach House', the proposed two-storey window would be similar in size to these windows. Furthermore, its position on the rear elevation would restrict any views of this window from public viewpoints. Overall, the scheme would respect the existing architectural features of the building and would preserve its distinctiveness.
7. For these reasons, the proposal would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing building.
8. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies SD1, SD2 and SE1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030 (July 2017) and Policy DC2 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan (January 2004), which all require development, including extensions, to contribute positively to an area's character and surroundings, protect distinctiveness, and respect the existing architectural features of the building.

Other Matters

9. The appeal site lies within the Styal Conservation Area (CA). I note that the reason for refusal raises no concerns regarding the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the CA. I have no reason to disagree and, together with the above reasons, the proposal would therefore preserve the character or appearance of the CA.
10. The appeal site also lies within the Green Belt. The Council has concluded that the proposed extension would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and, based on the evidence before me, I have no reason to disagree.

Conditions

11. I recommend the standard time limit condition and a condition specifying the approved plans to provide certainty and in the interests of proper planning.

12. Conditions requiring the external materials of the extension to match the materials of the existing property and regarding the colour and material of the rainwater goods, the reveal of the windows and external doors, and brickwork detailing are necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the property, surrounding area and Conservation Area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. The proposed extension would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing building. There are no material considerations which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal be allowed subject to the conditions listed above which are necessary in the interests of certainty and to safeguard the character and appearance of the existing building.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall allow the appeal and grant planning permission subject to the conditions above.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR