



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2023

by S R G Baird BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 23 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/22/3303741

The Fields, Middlewich Road, Holmes Chapel, CW4 7ET

- 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 D Robinson against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 21/6015C, dated 27 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey garage, the removal of the existing roof structure, a new roof including habitable living space, the demolition of a conservatory to the rear and a rear single-storey and roof extension.
-

Preliminary Matter

1. The decision notice refers to saved policies in the Congleton Borough Local Plan (CBLP). Since then, the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD) has been adopted and the saved CBLP policies are no longer extant. The parties had an opportunity to comment.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single-storey garage, the removal of the existing roof structure, a new roof including habitable living space, the demolition of a conservatory to the rear and a rear single-storey and roof extension at The Fields, Middlewich Road, Holmes Chapel, CW4 7ET in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1/6015C, dated 27 November 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 2. The materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, CM292 PL 01e, CM292 PL 02d and CM292 PL 04a.

Main Issue

4. The effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Planning Policy & Other Guidance

5. The development plan includes the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS) and the SADPD. The policy context is provided by CELPS Policies PG 6 and SD 2 and SADPD Policy RUR 11.
6. CELPS Policy SD 2 indicates that having regard to various factors, including height and scale, development should contribute positively to an area's character and identity. CELPS Policy PG 6 and SADPD Policy RUR 11 say that an extension to an existing dwelling may be permitted where it is not disproportionate to the original dwelling. In the open countryside, a proposal that would increase the size of the original building by more than 50% (nett floorspace), will usually be considered to represent a disproportionate addition.
7. In terms of the scale of the proposed extension, the planning officer's report, the submitted plans and the Grounds of Appeal (GoA) do not identify the scale of the extension in terms of floorspace. That said, whilst the GoA acknowledges that the proposal would represent a "*significant*" increase, the SADPD guideline figure is generic, and each proposal must be assessed on its own merits and circumstances.
8. The Fields is located within a ribbon of residential development in the open countryside. The only public views of the dwelling are obtained from the road to the front. In terms of height to the ridge, the proposed pitched roof would result in a modest increase in height. The changes to the front elevation are acknowledged by the Council as being acceptable and I have no reason to disagree. The changes to the front elevation would not appear incongruous or out of character with the existing building, the adjoining buildings, or the area.
9. Whilst the extension to the rear would project substantially beyond the main rear elevation of the adjoining dwellings (Trees and Elm Cottage) it would be well screened from private views from these dwellings. The dwellings in this linear group are set in deep wide plots with an extensive open aspect to the south, which would acceptably mitigate the impact of the rear extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusions

10. Whilst the proposed extension would be substantial and most likely exceed the floorspace guideline referred to in SADPD Policy RUR 11, it would not unacceptably affect the character and appearance of the area or the host building. Accordingly, the proposal would not conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. Accordingly, having taken all other matters into consideration, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

11. In the interests of appearance and clarity, the permission is subject to the standard conditions relating to the use of matching materials and listing the approved plans.

George Baird

Inspector