



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2023

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/23/3326661

The White House, Dig Lane, Acton, Cheshire East CW5 8PB

- 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 Williams against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 23/1264N, dated 30 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension to the rear at The White House, Dig Lane, Acton, Cheshire East CW5 8PB in accordance with the terms of the application Ref, 23/1264N, dated 30 March 2023, 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: OS Site Location Plan at 1:1250 scale, and the existing and proposed floor plan and elevations dated October 2022.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. In order to protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, Policy PG 6 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010 – 2030 (2017) ('CELPS') states that extensions will only be permitted if they are not disproportionate to the original dwelling. Policy RUR 11 of the Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (2022) ('CESADPD') notes that extensions to dwellings in the open countryside will usually be considered disproportionate where they would increase the size of the original building by more than 50%.
4. The White House is a detached two storey property, which is sited on a landscaped plot, in an area of countryside which includes a scattering of nearby buildings.

5. According to the Council, the original dwelling at The White House had a floorspace of approximately 93.8 square metres, but its subsequent two storey side, and single storey rear, extensions added around 92.4 square metres of floorspace. It continues that the scheme before me would add a further 10.6 square metres of floorspace, thus bringing the total cumulative increase to 109.8%. Having regard to the appellant's grounds of appeal, I have no reason to dispute those figures.
6. However, I observed on my visit that the proposed extension would be modestly proportioned, and that it would be unobtrusively located to the rear of the house, where it would be well-screened from the road by landscaping. It would simply infill a small corner of the building's footprint, without extending its envelope further in any direction. It would also be set in slightly from the host's side wall, thus ensuring some articulation, and it would match the form, style and materials of the existing single storey rear extension.
7. I therefore agree with the Council's view, as set out in its delegated report, that the extension's design would not be out of character with the area or the existing dwelling in terms of its appearance.
8. As the scheme would not harm the character or appearance of the host property or the area, it would comply with the stance on design, character, and visual impact in CELPS Policies SE 1, SD 1 and SD 2; CESADPD Policies GEN 1 and HOU 11; and Policies ENV3 and DEV1 of the Acton, Edleston and Henhull Neighbourhood Development Plan (2020).
9. Considered cumulatively, the extensions to The White House would be disproportionate to the original dwelling and there would thus be a conflict with CELPS Policy PG 6. However, the scheme would not conflict with CESADPD Policy RUR 11, given its stance that extensions amounting to more than a 50% increase may be acceptable where there would be no significant alteration to the building's envelope or external appearance. The scheme would thus comply with the thrust of the development plan when considered as a whole, and the appeal will be allowed.
10. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have considered those suggested by the Council in the appeal questionnaire. I have imposed the standard time limit and, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Finally, in the interests of good design, a condition is necessary requiring that the proposed extension be faced in matching materials.
11. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR