



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2022

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/22/3304425

19 Roewood Lane, Higher Hurdsfield, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK10 2PQ

- 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 and Mrs Heathcote against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 22/0179M, dated 18 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor inc. replacement roof, layout alterations and entrance canopy to traditional bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor inc. replacement roof, layout alterations and entrance canopy at 19 Roewood Lane, Higher Hurdsfield, Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK10 2PQ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 22/0179M, dated 18 January 2022, subject to the conditions below:-
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 0130 03 P1.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area. The development plan includes policies SE1 and SD2 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030 (2017) which seek to ensure that proposals contribute positively to their surroundings. The National Planning Policy Framework has a similar objective.
3. The appeal site comprises a modestly sized bungalow in a residential street of mainly bungalows and chalet bungalows built to varying designs, mainly in the 1960's or 1970's. Many have had loft conversions and/or roof extensions and there is a wide variety of roof forms, ridge heights and pitches, particularly on the opposite side of the street and further up the street from the appeal site. However, the appeal dwelling is one in a row of five bungalows that have not been extended at first floor level. All have a plain gabled frontage, a simple gabled roof form and ridge heights which follow the gradient of the street, although the pitch of each roof varies slightly.

4. I disagree with the Council that the cohesiveness of the row makes a positive contribution to the character of the area as the remainder of the street is characterised by a much greater variety of designs and many examples of different roof forms and pitches sitting side by side. It is this variety which contributes to the attractiveness of the area rather than the similarity of this row of bungalows.
5. The proposal includes the raising of the ridge height by 1m to provide a first floor level within the roof space. This would result in a steeper roof pitch and this together with the increased ridge height would disrupt the consistency of the row to some extent. However, as the eaves would remain at the same height and the proposal contains no dormers, it would result in a simple roof form that would not sit uncomfortably within the row or the wider street scene.
6. I have noted that prior approval was given earlier this year (22/2296M) for a scheme for a further storey which would increase the ridge to the same height as in this proposal but would also increase the eaves height, resulting in a dwelling of significantly greater bulk and, together with its shallower roof pitch, a boxier, less attractive design than proposed here. A Lawful Development Certificate was also submitted at the same time for an alternative scheme which, although not yet determined, includes a side dormer along most of the length of the dwelling on its northern side elevation and therefore a greater amount of bulk on the front and northern side elevations.
7. The appeal proposal would be less bulky and is of a more attractive design than either of those schemes and the fallback position of the prior approval scheme, which could be built if this appeal were dismissed, adds significant weight to my findings.
8. I conclude then that the proposed development would contribute positively to its surroundings and would not result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with LP policies SE1 and SD2.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in order to provide certainty. A condition requiring that external materials will match those of the existing dwelling is not necessary because the Council has not objected to the proposed materials and given the variety of materials within the street those materials specified in the application are acceptable.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal accords with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh this. The appeal should be allowed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector