



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2023

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/23/3323747

Ashdown, Sandy Lane, Weaverham, Northwich CW8 3PX

- 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 Mrs Emma Shone against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03474/FUL, dated 10 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Alterations to 21/01834/FUL to amend dormer cladding material to cedar boarding'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The development proposed is already in situ. Therefore, I have considered this appeal on the basis that planning permission is sought retrospectively.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the dormer on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Ashdown is a detached two-storey dwelling and occupies a large plot on Shady Lane. It sits amongst other residential properties on Shady Lane and Shady Brook Lane which sits to the rear of the site. There are a mix of dwelling types in the vicinity of the appeal site. However, they mainly consist of traditional architecture and facing materials. Roof forms are generally pitched and largely devoid of bulky additions. The principal features of the appeal dwelling, including its slate covered pitched main roof, give it a distinctive traditional aesthetic which complement the quality of the built environment to this part of Weaverham.
5. Section 5 of the Cheshire West and Chester House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings Supplementary Planning Document (2021) (SPD) provides guidance for roof extensions and confirms amongst other things that rear dormers that are subordinate to the roofscape and have a similar appearance to the existing roof material will be supported.
6. The considerable boxed form and off-centre position of the dormer detracts from the simple pitched form and symmetry of the host dwelling's roof. This is emphasised by the unsympathetic cedar cladding facing material which does not assimilate well with the slate on the main roof slope. This is most evident in

views from surrounding properties and the street, particularly on Shady Brook Lane.

7. The appellant suggests that the cedar cladding will weather and grey and integrate with the existing roofing materials. In the alternative, they would accept a condition requiring that the cladding be painted. However, in either case, I am not persuaded that the texture or appearance of the cladding would acceptably blend with the main slate roof or the general high quality of the surrounding built environment.
8. I conclude, the dormer as proposed has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it conflicts with the high standard of design, character and high-quality material requirements of Policy ENV6 (High quality design and sustainable construction) of the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan Part One: Strategic Policies (2015) and Policies DM3 and DM21 (Development within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse) of the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan Part Two: Land Allocations and Detailed Policies (2018). For the same reasons it also conflicts with the SPD and the requirements in the National Planning Policy Framework for developments to be of a good design and to add to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matter

9. I understand that there is an existing planning permission¹ which includes a dormer of the same form and position within the roof slope. However, given that planning permission includes a condition specifically requiring that dormer be completed in materials of matching colour and texture to the roofing material of the existing dwelling, I do not find that fallback position comparable to the specific proposal before me.

Conclusion

10. The dormer as proposed has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. The development therefore conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR

¹ LPA Ref 21/01834/FUL