



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2023

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/22/3307660

1 Georgia Place, Great Sankey, Warrington, WA5 8BB

- 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 S Singaravelu against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/39895 dated 3 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension to rear of dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbours, with regards to outlook and privacy.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modern detached two storey dwelling. It is located within a residential area characterised by the presence of modern detached two storey dwellings of brick and tile construction.
 4. The appeal property is set well back from the road, behind a front garden and a semi-detached garage and driveway. It has a modest garden to the rear.
 5. During my site visit, I observed that the rear gardens of houses along Georgia Place tend to back onto the rear gardens of dwellings on Maryland Close. Due to the modest size and juxtaposition of properties, there is scope for the overlooking of neighbouring gardens from the rear elevations of dwellings along Georgia Place and Maryland Close.
 6. I also noted during my site visit that the presence of garden fences and planting combines with existing distances between rear elevations to limit significant harm arising in respect of privacy.
 7. Further to the above, the siting of the appeal property and its immediate neighbour, Number 2 Georgia Place, is such that both houses angle slightly towards each other to the rear.
-

8. The proposed development would extend the appeal property to the rear, at two storey height, across its full width. As a result, the proposal would project to the rear at a considerable height and in extremely close proximity to the rear elevation of No 2.
9. I find that the proximity of the proposal, when combined with its projection and height, along with the juxtaposition of the two dwellings as referred to above, would result in it appearing to “loom” above the shared rear boundary to an overbearing degree. This would to the significant detriment of the outlook of neighbouring occupiers of No 2.
10. In addition to the above, the proposal would result in first floor windows looking down over the rear gardens of Number 2 Georgia Place and Number 2 Maryland Close from a dominant position. The height and close proximity of these windows would result in scope for actual and perceived overlooking and this would be to the detriment of the privacy of neighbours.
11. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of neighbours with regards to outlook and privacy, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Local Plan¹ policies QE6 and QE7; and to the Council’s House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2021), which together amongst other things, seek to protect residential amenity.

Other Matters

12. Whilst the appellant draws my attention to changes to the original proposal which lessen its impact, I have found that the proposed development before me would result in significant harm to residential amenity and hence the decision below.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

¹ Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).