The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 April 2023

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/22/3308573
12 Buckingham Drive, Great Sankey, Warrington WA5 1JE

- 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 Vincent Moran against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
- The application Ref 2022/40950, dated 7 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2022.
- The development proposed is a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension at 12 Buckingham Drive, Great Sankey, Warrington WA5 1JE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2022/40950, dated 7 February 2022, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan Scale 1:1250, Proposed Block Plan Scale 1:500 and Proposed Plans DRG NO. AHT 2328-A.

   3) The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the area indicated on the approved plans for parking has been surfaced and drained in accordance with the details shown. The parking area shall be retained as such thereafter.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. This appeal concerns a two storey detached dwelling which occupies a generous and prominent corner plot within a residential area which is predominantly characterised by semi-detached properties.

4. The House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (June 2021) (the SPD) provides guidance on side extensions, including those to properties occupying corner plots. Of particular relevance is the guidance indicating that side extensions should usually be no more than 50% greater in width than the original house, should not project beyond the front elevations of properties on the adjacent roads where there is a consistent and prominent building line, and should not take up more than half the width of the garden between the property and adjacent highway.

5. The proposed two storey side extension would be of a generous width and would have a ridge line which matches that of the host dwelling. Nevertheless, it would be well set back from the front elevation and would not extend beyond the rear of the original dwelling. This would ensure a sufficient degree of subservience so as not to over dominate the host dwelling. Further, as the host dwelling is of a detached design, which is an anomaly in this locality, the design of the proposed extension would not interrupt the predominant character of the area.

6. Although the proposal would project beyond the rear building line on Hampton Drive, I observed that many corner properties in the immediate locality have been extended in a similar way. Moreover, the large plot ensures sufficient space would remain to the side so as to ensure the open and spacious feel to this part of the street scene would remain. There would also be good separation to the adjacent property on Hampton Drive. As such, the extension would not appear as an incongruous or prominent addition in the street scene.

7. Therefore, whilst the proposal would fail to accord with the aforementioned guidance, the SPD recognises that there may be instances where the character of the property and the surrounding area can support larger proposals than those which would normally satisfy the guidance. For the reasons given above, I consider this proposal to be one such instance.

8. Accordingly, the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It therefore accords with Policy QE7 of the Warrington Borough Council Local Plan Core Strategy (July 2014) which seeks to ensure developments are designed to reinforce local distinctiveness and enhance the character, appearance and function of the street scene, local area and townscape, and harmonise with the scale and proportions of existing buildings, amongst other things.

Other Matter

9. I note the Council's concerns regarding parking provision. The submitted plans indicate an additional parking space would be provided and I observed good levels of on-street parking availability at the time of my site visit. There is nothing before me to indicate this was unusual. As such, the resultant larger dwelling would be adequately served by the additional parking proposed. This could be appropriately controlled via condition, in line with the Council's suggestion.

Conditions

10. Further to the above, I shall attach the standard conditions concerning the time limit and plans. A condition requiring the proposal to be finished in materials to match the existing property is not necessary as this is indicated on the approved plans.

Conclusion

11. The proposal accords with the development plan and there are no other considerations which indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be allowed.

H Ellison INSPECTOR