



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2022

by David Jones BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/22/3304853

11 Spinney End, Tattenhall, Cheshire CH3 9HD

- 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 Lucy Meek against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02034/FUL, dated 29 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is the addition of render to each elevation and cladding to one wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the addition of render to each elevation and cladding to one wall at 11 Spinney End, Tattenhall, Cheshire CH3 9HD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/02034/FUL, dated 29 April 2021, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matters

2. I have used the Council's description of development in reaching my decision as it more accurately describes the proposal. The appellant's appeal form also makes reference to the updated description.
3. The works have been carried out and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis. For clarity, render has been applied to each elevation of the dwelling with cladding added to the front elevation of the existing side extension.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. 11 Spinney End (No 11) is a two-storey detached dwelling located towards the head of the cul-de-sac. Following the completion of the appeal scheme, the property now has off-white coloured render applied to its external walls with darker cladding added to the front elevation of the side extension. The surrounding area is residential in character and comprises a mixture of two-storey and single storey dwellings which are predominantly of brick finish, albeit several have white cladding on front facing dormer windows.
6. The Council contend that the use of render and cladding would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, as neither form part of the palette of materials found within

the street scene which remains characterised by dwellings with predominately brickwork finishes.

7. Spinney End is a secluded cul-de-sac which is not overly prominent in the wider area, resulting in views of its properties being largely restricted to from within Spinney End itself. No 11 is tucked away towards the head of the cul-de-sac and despite being two-storey, is not prominent or highly visible upon entering the cul-de-sac or in the wider street scene due primarily to the layout of the properties and the presence of existing landscaping.
8. Although the dwellings on Spinney End have largely retained their original brickwork finish, they incorporate different house types and designs with some showing evidence of more recent alterations. This includes 2 Spinney End, a single storey dwelling located towards the opposite end of the cul-de-sac which has had render applied to its external walls. These variations in house type and design result in a street scene which is not uniform in appearance.
9. Whilst the use of render and cladding represents a change from the brickwork finish of most neighbouring properties, given the appeal property's lack of prominence and the variety of house types and designs in the street scene, I do not consider that this change results in a visually intrusive form of development or results in harm being caused to the character and appearance of the area.
10. A letter and report from a builder have also been provided by the appellant which advises that the removal of the render from the appeal property would likely result in damage being caused, and the existing brick face not being salvageable. In any event, it is apparent from the information before me that invasive ivy growth had already resulted in the property's brickwork being damaged to the detriment of its external appearance. Consequently, I consider that the appeal proposal results in an improvement to the visual appearance of the host property which in turn makes a positive contribution to the overall character and appearance of the area.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of either the host property or the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy ENV6 of the Cheshire West & Chester Council Local Plan (Part One) Strategic Policies (adopted January 2015), Policies DM3 and DM21 of the Cheshire West & Chester Council Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies (adopted July 2019), Policy 2 of the Tattenhall and District Neighbourhood Plan, and guidance contained within the Cheshire West and Chester Council Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings (January 2021). These policies, among other matters, seek to ensure that developments respect the character and appearance of any existing building and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has referred to previous planning permissions¹ which have been granted by the Council for developments in Tattenhall that have included the application of render and/or cladding to their external walls. Whilst I do not have the full details of all these developments before me, I noted during my

¹ Council References 20/03263/FUL, 19/01002/FUL, 18/00702/FUL, 19/02727/FUL

site visit that although located within the village none were in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. Though these sites evidence the use of cladding or render in the wider locality, they are found on properties with different site contexts and therefore are not directly comparable to the appeal scheme. In any event, I have considered the scheme in relation to its own context and upon its own merits.

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested conditions relating to the statutory timeframe for commencement, a requirement to comply with the approved plans, and for the materials to be used in the construction of external surfaces of the development to be as specified on the application form and approved plans. However, as the development is complete it is not necessary for these conditions to be imposed.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Jones

INSPECTOR