

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/R0660/D/22/3308127

108 Colleys Lane, Willaston, CW5 6NT

- 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 Barratt against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 21/6063N, dated 25 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is re-modelling of existing dormer bungalow to create two storey dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dormer bungalow with a small single storey detached garage to the side. It is located within the open countryside along Colleys Lane, which in this location comprises a ribbon development of detached dwellings set in garden plots along one side of the road, surrounded by farmland.
 4. Like neighbouring dwellings, the appeal property is set well-back from Colleys Lane behind a grass verge and a front garden and it has a long garden to the rear, which backs onto open countryside.
 5. The slope of the roof and gaps between the dwelling and its side boundaries provide for spaciousness around the appeal property and for a significant sense of the countryside beyond.
 6. To the front, the appeal property looks out across Colleys Lane to a grass verge, footpath, hedgerows, trees and fields beyond.
 7. During my site visit, I observed that, for some considerable distance, dwellings to the south east of the appeal property tend to comprise bungalows or dormer bungalows within spacious garden plots; and whilst the appeal property's immediate neighbour to the south east, Number 106 Colleys Lane, is a two storey dwelling, it appears within a very spacious setting, due in particular to
-

the low height of and the space that exists around, both the appeal property and Number 104 Colleys Lane, a bungalow.

8. As a consequence of all of the above, the appeal property sits comfortably within its rural surroundings and appears in keeping with the area's green and spacious qualities.
9. The proposed development would greatly alter the appearance of the existing dwelling. A modest dormer bungalow would be transformed into a dwelling of significantly greater height, width and depth.
10. In this regard, I find that the proposed development would not appear subordinate to the host dwelling, but rather, that the overall scale and volume of the proposal would overwhelm and dominate the appearance of the host dwelling.
11. As such, I find that the proposed development would comprise a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling.
12. Further to the above, I consider that the proposal would, due to its overall scale, volume, proposed materials and design, draw attention to itself as a visually intrusive development, in considerable contrast to the simpler and considerably smaller existing dwelling. The proposal would appear an unduly dominant and out of keeping with its spacious rural surroundings.
13. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (2017) Policies PG6, SD2 and SE1; to the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan (2005) Policy RES.11; to Willaston Neighbourhood Plan Policies D1 and H6; and to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Extensions and Householder Development (2008), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

14. In support of the proposal, the appellants draw attention to other planning permissions elsewhere. However, I have found that the proposal would result in harm and this is not a matter mitigated or outweighed by the presence of other developments elsewhere.
15. The appellants refer to a fallback position based on Permitted Development Rights. I have determined this appeal based on the proposal the subject of the appeal. There is nothing before me to demonstrate that a development the same as that the subject of this appeal could be achieved via Permitted Development Rights.

Conclusion

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

N McGurk

INSPECTOR