



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2023

by J Symmons BSc (Hons) CEng MICE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26.10.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/23/3322530

14 Main Road, Cheshire East, Shavington CW2 5DY

- 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 Richard Manley against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 22/3454N, dated 27 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is an extension over garage with glass link.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council refers to National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) dated 2021 in its appeal statement. The Framework was revised in September 2023. The 2023 revisions are not relevant to this appeal and I have therefore not consulted the parties on this change. I have determined the appeal within the context of the current Framework.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupants at 12 Main Road in terms of outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is an extended semi-detached house. It has a detached single-storey garage which is slightly set back from its front elevation and extends to its rear. The garage is located very close to the boundary with 12 Main Road (No 12).
5. The proposal would add a new first-floor storey with front and rear windows and side dormer windows to the front part of the existing garage. The proposal would be connected to the house by a first-floor glazed and flat-roofed link.
6. With its location at the end of the semi-detached row and having a single-storey garage and low neighbouring bungalow, the appeal site is in an open and prominent location in the street view. The proposal would be set to a lower height than the house, not extend the full length of the garage and only increase the eave height by approximately 1.3 metres (m). However, it would still, even with the separation between the house and garage, practically

extend the house across the full frontage of the appeal site and along the gable of the house. It would be a large and dominant addition which would be an imposing feature in the street view. The use of matching materials and the inclusion of dormer windows, while trying to respect the existing buildings and break up the proposed roof, would further emphasize the proposal's appearance as a large and dominating extension to the house.

7. The glazed link would be a modern addition and not a characteristic feature of the area. Nevertheless, due to its small size and see-through nature and the building screening that would occur with its set back, it would not be highly visible or visually harmful. It would, however, not address the adverse effects that I have found from the proposal's first floor and roof.
8. The proposal's design has attempted, through the use of similar materials and by reducing its height and size, to comply with the design principles set out in the Supplementary Planning Document for Extensions and Householder Development (2008) (SPD) published by the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich. However, as noted above, the overall effect of the proposal would be a disproportionate addition. It would not be in keeping with the house's setting, scale or form and as such would not comply with the SPD's guidance for improvements and alterations for existing dwellings.
9. Reference is made to a similar cottage plot receiving planning permission for a detached house. However, no details of this permission are provided, and I cannot be sure it is comparable to the proposal. In any event, I have considered the appeal site on its own planning merits.
10. Consequently, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policies SD1, SD2 and SE1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030 (LPS), July 2017, Policies GEN1 and HOU11 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (SADPD), December 2022, and Policy HOU4 of the Shavington-cum-Gresty Neighbourhood Plan. These policies seek, amongst other matters, that developments should make a positive contribution to their surroundings, create or reinforce local distinctiveness and extensions or alterations should be in keeping with the scale, character and appearance of their surroundings.
11. It would also be contrary to Paragraph 130 of the Framework which seeks, amongst other matters, to ensure new development is visually attractive and is sympathetic to local character.

Living Conditions

12. The proposal would sit very close to the boundary with No 12's side garden. Even with only a 1.3m increase in wall height, the proposal's wall and roof expanse would still have a dominating and overbearing effect on a large part of the neighbouring side garden compared to the existing situation. It would unacceptably harm the neighbouring occupant's garden outlook.
13. While the inclusion of the proposed dormer windows would break up the expanse of the proposed roof to a degree, their projection and form would add to the overall proposal's dominance on the garden.
14. I appreciate that there would be a reasonable separation between the proposal and the bungalow, but this does not prevent it from harming the side garden area. While I note No 12 is a large plot and has a number of gardens, from my

visit, the side one offers the occupants a better level of privacy and openness to direct sunlight away from the bungalow than the other gardens. As such, there is little justification for this side garden to be harmed by the proposal.

15. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy SD2 of the LPS, Policies HOU11 and HOU12 of the SADPD and Policy HOU4 of the Shavington-cum-Gresty Neighbourhood Plan. These seek, amongst other matters, for development not to cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of nearby occupiers of dwellings.

Other Matters

16. I note that the ground floor of the garage would be retained for car parking and no comments in relation to highway issues have been raised. However, this does not change my view regarding the harm I have found with the proposal in terms of character and appearance and living conditions.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Symmons

INSPECTOR