



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2022

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/22/3302771

7 Alder Road, Woolston, Warrington WA1 4EJ

- 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 David Smith of the Emerald Bay Group against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 2021/39924, dated 6 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is remodelling of existing dwelling and construction of 2 storey front and side extension with new entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for remodelling of existing dwelling and construction of 2 storey front and side extension with new entrance porch at 7 Alder Road, Woolston, Warrington WA1 4EJ in accordance with the terms of application ref: 2021/39924, dated 6 August 2021, and subject to the following condition:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL.001 Location Plan, PL.003 Revision A Proposed Site Plan and PL.004 Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations.

Preliminary Matter

2. The development was completed at the time of my site visit.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and area.

Reasons

4. No.7 Alder Road is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in an area of similar dwellings, some of which have been extended to the front, side and rear. The Council considers that the development causes no harm to the residential amenity of neighbours. I see no reason to disagree as it causes no significant increased loss of privacy, received light or outlook.
5. The Officer report describes the two-storey element of the development to the front and side of the property as being highly visible in the street scene. However, the dwelling is not in a corner position, but is part of a row of

dwelling, some of which have single storey front extensions of varying size, scale and design. The dwelling has been finished with pale painted render, but there is another example of render treatment at No.25 Alder Road nearby. The Council advised that the new brickwork did not match that of the existing building. However, the appellant has since applied stain to the brickwork so that it now appears as harmonious in colour. Within the context of surrounding dwellings, I consider that the appeal dwelling is neither particularly prominent nor significantly incongruous.

6. The Council has a House Extensions supplementary planning document. The Planning Officer's report indicates that the side extension meets the guidance for a 1 m minimum gap from the boundary with the adjacent dwelling. It also complies with advice that extensions should be no more than 50% greater in width than the original house.
7. The side extension is not set down from the main ridgeline of the house, in conflict with the Council's guidance, but the front projection has a hipped roof and therefore provides an impression of subservience. The guidance advises that any extension to the front of a house should have minimal projection. The front extension does not conflict with this advice because it only projects around 1.36 m from the front elevation of the house (excluding the front porch canopy) and generally respects the building line for the front of immediately neighbouring houses. Overall, I consider that the size and scale of the development, including the fenestration, is acceptable.
8. I find that the proposal would have no significant detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the building or area. It would therefore not conflict with policy QE7 of the Warrington Borough Council Core Strategy, which seeks to ensure, amongst other things, that development harmonises with the scale, proportions and materials of adjacent buildings and is visually attractive.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has submitted examples of similar extensions in the vicinity at Nos.3 and 4 Ivy Road. However, that pair of semi-detached dwellings is not seen in conjunction with the appeal building and is located at the end of a cul-de-sac which has dwellings of varied design. The appellant also referred to policy CS1 of the Warrington Local Plan Core Strategy and paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework which support sustainable development. In this respect the development provides additional family accommodation and making more efficient use of land at the appeal site.

Conditions

10. A condition is imposed to confirm the approved plans.

Conclusion

11. I have taken all other matters raised into account. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR