



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2023

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/23/3316172

The Paddock, Wervin Road, Wervin, Chester CH2 4BP

- 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 Ryan Parry against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
- The application Ref 22/00024/FUL, dated 3 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 November 2022.
- The development proposed is extension and alterations to the existing dwelling.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the extension and alteration of the appeal dwelling only and planning permission is granted for the extension and alterations to the existing dwelling at The Paddock, Wervin Road, Wervin, Chester CH2 4BP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00024/FUL, dated 3 January 2022, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted, and 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: DWG PL00
Proposed Ground Floor: DWG 2322021 (PL) 001_0G
Proposed First Floor: DWG 2322021 (PL) 001_1G
Proposed Roof Plan: DWG 2322021 (PL) 001_2G
Proposed Elevations (North & South): DWG 2322021 (PL) 002_0G
Proposed Elevations (East & West): DWG 2322021 (PL) 002_1G
2. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed boundary treatment.

Preliminary Matters

3. At the time of my site visit alterations to the front boundary had already taken place. For the avoidance of doubt, I have considered the scheme against the submitted plans. I shall return to this matter later.
4. I have removed superfluous detail from the description of development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a modest, two storey dwelling which occupies a raised position on a corner plot. It is located in a predominantly rural area, where the surrounding dwellings typically have traditional characteristics and spacious settings.
7. The proposed front extension would have a limited overall projection from the front of the original dwelling. It would however have a gable design and incorporate extensive areas of glazing. It would undoubtedly change the character and appearance of the original dwelling.
8. Nevertheless, the host dwelling is a visually unremarkable property. It does not have features typical of the traditional vernacular in this locality. Although the front extension would not follow the roof profile of the original dwelling, it would have clean lines, swathes of glazing and an overall contemporary look. This design would be a sympathetic nod to and modern interpretation of the more traditional properties in the locality and the glazed apex the front would be somewhat muted by the slated timber work. Whilst such a prominent front entrance feature may not be appropriate in many cases, for the reasons given I find that it would not result in harm in this instance.
9. The dwelling would also be extended to the side at first floor level above the existing garage. Whilst this element would have a hipped roof and front facing gable, by virtue of the proposed front extension this design would not appear awkward but rather it would be well integrated. Along with its set-back from the front extension and ground floor canopy which runs the width of the property, and its lower ridge height, this element would have a degree of subservience and would not be overly dominant to the host dwelling.
10. The proposed rear extension would incorporate a section of flat roof into its design. It would be a contemporary addition which would be incorporated into a projecting rear gable. Given this, along with its very limited projection beyond the rear wall and as it would not be readily visible from the public domain, I consider that it would not result in visual harm to the host dwelling or wider area.
11. I note the guidance within the Cheshire West & Chester Council Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings (January 2021) which the Council considers the proposal to conflict with, namely that it would result in development which would not be subordinate to the main dwelling. However, taking all elements of the proposal into account, both individually and together, I consider the proposed development would not be harmfully disproportionate or would increase the scale and mass of the dwelling by a significant extent. Rather, it reflects an evolution of the host property and is a well-considered and sympathetic alteration which is more akin to a complete redesign of the original dwelling.
12. Turning now to the front boundary treatment, the area is predominantly characterised by low walls, hedgerows and open timber fences and gates, all of which make a positive contribution to the rural surrounds. To the contrary, the proposed tall brick posts, rendered walls and the large solid gate would collectively result in a very substantial expanse of a hard boundary which would be drastically at odds with the prevailing boundary treatment in this locality. It would be more typical of an urban area. By virtue of the appeal sites

prominent corner position and its raised topography, the incongruous boundary treatment would be visually dominant to passers-by in this verdant, rural location, thus significantly detracting from the wider setting and eroding the rural characteristics.

13. Indeed, during my site visit I noted that, on the approach to the site the boundary alterations which have occurred, which are partly reflective of the development shown on the proposed plans, were visually imposing and discordant in the area.
14. Notwithstanding this however, I note that this element of the proposed development is clearly severable, both physically and functionally, from the alterations and extensions to the main dwellinghouse. Therefore, I can see no reason why I cannot issue a split decision in this appeal.
15. Taking all the above into consideration, insofar as the proposal relates to the extensions and alterations to the host dwelling, it would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with Policies DM3 and DM21 of the Cheshire West and Chester Council Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies (the CWCLP2) which collectively seek to ensure that developments are of a high-quality design which respect the character of the area, amongst other things.
16. Despite the letters of support, insofar as the proposal relates to the boundary treatment, it would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and thus would conflict with the aims of Policies DM3 and DM21 of the CWCLP2 as set out above.

Other Matter

17. The Council's handling of the planning application is not a matter for me within the context of this appeal.

Conditions

18. I have attached the standard time limit and plans list conditions, in the interests of certainty. There is no need to attach a condition specifying or requiring details of materials, as these are specified on the approved plans.
19. The Council has not recommended attaching any other conditions and there are no others which I deem necessary.

Conclusion

20. The proposed extensions and alterations to the appeal dwelling accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations which indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. The appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to this matter.
21. For the reasons given, the proposed boundary treatment is contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh this. The appeal should therefore be dismissed in this regard.

H Ellison
INSPECTOR