The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2022

by K Ford MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/22/3309787
20 Primrose Hill, Cuddington, Northwich, Cheshire CW8 2TZ

- 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 David Hignett against the decision of Cheshire West & Chester Council.
- The application Ref 22/01047/FUL, dated 17 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2022.
- The development proposed is 2 storey side extension over and behind an existing garage with single storey rear extension and associated alterations.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached dwelling located at the end of a row of properties on elevated ground in a cul de sac. A side garden for the dwelling is located adjacent to the property and so there are open views of the dwelling as you enter the cul de sac. This is emphasised further by the position of the dwelling on elevated ground giving the dwelling a prominent appearance in the street scene. The remainder of the road largely comprises of 2 and 3 storey dwellings of varying styles and designs.

4. The proposed extension over the double garage would cover the full width of the garage and would stand forward of the elevation containing the front door, despite being set behind the building line created by the existing living room and bedroom one. This would notably alter the proportions of the dwelling. The extension over the garage combined with the 2 storey rearward extension would appear prominent within the street, exaggerated by the elevated position and views of the front and side of the property from within the street.

5. Whilst the proposal would not create a terracing effect with neighbouring properties, it would nevertheless be visually obtrusive and not subservient to the main dwelling irrespective of the garages being an existing element of the dwelling. I disagree with the appellant that the fence and planting would provide adequate screening. The development would be clearly visible within the street scene, even when the trees were in leaf.

6. The development would be set down from the main roof and use materials that match the existing dwelling. However, this would not overcome the harm created by the bulkiness of the proposal. Whilst the appellant has identified that alternative design options would have a more harmful impact, this does not make the proposal acceptable. I understand the reasoning for the proposal given by the appellant but this would be outweighed by the harm identified.

7. Irrespective of the absence of any impact on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring dwellings, the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such it would conflict with the part of Policy ENV6 of the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (Part One) which requires new development to respect local character and achieve a sense of place through appropriate layout and design.

8. It would also conflict with Policy DM3 and DM21 of the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (Part 2). Amongst other things, these policies expect development to achieve a high standard of design that respects the character and protects the visual amenity of the local area with the design of the development required to respect the scale, character and appearance of any existing building and contribute positively to the character of the area. With regards extensions to existing dwellings, they are only supported where the resulting development is in keeping with the character and appearance of, and is subordinate to, the original dwelling and surrounding properties and the wider setting.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR