



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 August 2022 by N Unwin BSc (hons) MSc

Decision by Chris Forrett BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/22/3300568

1 Crossley Crescent, Chester CH2 3EZ

- 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 David Rowland against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02694/FUL, dated 12 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is the extension and alterations to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is surrounded on three sides by the A41, a heavily used road comprising multiple lanes, and the quieter roads of Crossley Crescent and Pipers Lane. The sections of Crossley Crescent and Pipers Lane surrounding the appeal site are residential in character with the street scene formed mostly of semi-detached and terraced two storey dwellings similar in their scale and relationship to the highway.
5. In contrast to the prevailing development in the area, the appeal site consists of a large detached two storey dwelling positioned within a generous plot. It also lacks the uniformity of the surrounding dwellings described above. The appeal property has a simple and compact form with two gable walls flanking a recessed central section forming the south-west elevation facing onto Pipers Lane.
6. The proposal would involve the addition of a single storey extension adjoining the south-west elevation. The extension would extend approximately two thirds of the way along the existing south-west elevation and would be around 8 metres beyond it to the south-west. On the north-west elevation there would also be a two-storey bay window of a traditional design.

7. Due to the excessive scale of the proposed single storey extension, it would dramatically alter the form of the existing property. The proposal would unbalance and erode the existing simplistic and compact character and appearance of the host dwelling, particularly given the distance the single storey extension would project to the south-west.
8. Turning to the effect of the proposal on the street scene, as noted above, the host dwelling is fundamentally different in its scale, design, and relationship to the highway to that of the surrounding dwellings forming the distinctive character of the street scene. As such, although the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, it would not give rise to a significant adverse impact to the street scene in itself. However, as a result of the excessive single storey projection, there would be some limited harm to the street scene. Whilst this level of harm is not determinative on its own, it does nevertheless add weight to the harm I have identified to the host dwelling.
9. In respect of the two-storey bay window, I acknowledge that the traditional design would contrast with that of the host dwelling. Nevertheless, the bay window would appear proportionate and subservient. Furthermore, this architectural feature would act as a visual link with the more traditional dwellings within the area. Therefore, the two-storey bay window would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or street scene.
10. For the above reasons the proposal as a whole would result in an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policy ENV6 of the Cheshire West & Cheshire Council Local Plan Part One: Strategic Policies and Policies DM3 and DM21 of the Cheshire West & Cheshire Council Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies which require proposals to be of a high quality design and extensions to respect the character and appearance of the host building.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has raised the issue of noise pollution generated from the A41. It is also stated that the garden area adjacent to Pipers Lane is used as the primary garden space as it is the area least affected by noise pollution, evidenced by the submitted DEFRA Road Noise Pollution map. The appellant infers that the proposal would provide private quiet outdoor space that is essential for mental wellbeing. Whilst I have no reason to dispute this, there is very little evidence to suggest that the proposal would improve this situation, or that this would be the only way to achieve this. Furthermore, the proposal would reduce the area of garden least affected by the noise pollution from the A41.
12. In addition to the above I note the lack of objection from neighbouring residents with regards to the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. However, this in itself does not justify allowing the proposal which I have found to be otherwise harmful.
13. Finally, the appellant has questioned the lack of opportunity to address the Council's concerns in that it would have been possible to include additional windows, together with screening and boundary fence adjustments. However,

whilst I have some sympathy in that respect, the appeal must be determined on the submitted plans.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR