



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2022

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/22/3305840

27 Bartholomew Way, Chester CH4 7RJ

- 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 Miss Graham-Benson against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/01723/FUL, dated 9 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Extensions to the dwelling were granted permission by the Council under application reference 21/02597/FUL. The appeal proposal includes an additional front extension which was removed from application reference 21/02597/FUL).

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. No.27 Bartholomew Way is a two-storey detached dwelling located within a residential area. The dwelling is situated within the settlement boundary for Chester and the Curzon Park (Chester) Conservation Area lies immediately to the north of the site. The appeal dwelling is situated at the head of a cul-de-sac along with No.25 Bartholomew Way. The two dwellings have a single storey element at ground floor level which creates an asymmetrical front elevation and mirrored symmetry when the pair of dwellings are viewed together. There are different building designs within the wider estate. However, the design of the appeal building is replicated throughout the area and contributes towards its character and appearance. In general, there are few alterations to the front elevations of this form of dwelling.
5. The appellants advise that the two dwellings are not in a prominent position at the end of a cul-de-sac. Despite this, it was apparent at my site inspection that vehicles use the area for turning and a public footpath also links to the road. The two dwellings are also clearly viewed together from Bartholomew Way across the open plan frontages, with their symmetry in design apparent.

6. The symmetry of Nos. 25 and 27 Bartholomew Way has been slightly eroded following alterations at the front elevation of No.25 to create a covered porch through the application of contemporary design features. However, the general form of the front elevation remains providing a distinctive character in design. The proposed front extension to No.27 would result in the main part of the dwelling having a symmetrical appearance if the already approved central gabled porch was constructed. Despite this, the current combined mirrored symmetry of Nos.25 and 27, would be further reduced to an unacceptable degree by the proposed front extension.
7. The appellants consider that the proposal is a small extension that would not result in a wrap-around extension and the roof would not project above the height of the first-floor window cills. Nevertheless, the proposal would conflict with the Council's supplementary planning document: House extensions and domestic outbuildings, which advises that original design features must be given adequate clearance and regard should be had to preserving any existing symmetry.
8. I find that the proposed front extension would have a significant detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and area, including the increased loss of symmetry with the neighbouring dwelling of No.25 Bartholomew Way. It would conflict with policy ENV 6 of the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (Part One) which indicates that development should, where appropriate, respect local character through layout and design. It would fail to conform with Policies DM 3 and DM 21 of the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (Part Two) which together seek to ensure that extensions are in keeping with the character and appearance of the original dwelling, surrounding properties and the visual amenity of the local area. It would also conflict with the objective in the National Planning Policy Framework of achieving well designed places.

Conclusion

9. I have taken all other matters raised into account. However, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR