



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2024

by Alison Hartley, LLB(Hons), Solicitor, MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27TH February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/23/3335771

16 Surrey Road, Gawsworth, Cheshire East, SK11 7XA

- 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 Gary Adamson against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 23/1961/M, dated 23 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is double storey side and rear extensions including associated single storey front and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Issues

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been updated since the appeal was made. However, as the revisions do not affect the matters under consideration in this appeal, it was not considered necessary to seek further comment.
3. The Appellant states in their submission that they would have been willing to add fenestration details to the two-storey addition and refer to a plan in the appeal submission, KH668-101 Revision K dated 24 October 2023. This plan pre-dates the plan on which the application before me was determined. For the avoidance of doubt, I have considered plan KH668-101 Revision M dated 25 November 2023 that was submitted with the original application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The area in which the appeal property is situated is characterised predominantly by two-storey semi-detached dwellings of similar architectural style. Regular gaps between the dwellings are evident and this feature of the area distinguishes it from areas of terraced housing.
6. The proposed two storey side extension would abut the shared boundary and thus due to the proximity of the side elevation at No.14 give rise to a terracing

effect within the streetscape that would be at odds with the existing character of the area. The lack of fenestration to the front elevation of the first-floor element of the side extension would unduly reinforce the imposing presence of the extension in the street scene, and would be out of character with the other properties in the area where fenestration on the front elevation is evident.

7. My attention has been drawn to other examples of “flush” two storey side extensions in the area. However, I do not have full details of any planning approvals that gave rise to these schemes and therefore these may be different and do not set a precedent. As such, they are of limited weight in my decision. Having considered the appeal proposal on its own merits I find that the existence of other extensions in the area does not outweigh the harm caused by the proposal.
8. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find that the proposal conflicts with Policies SE1, SD1 and SD2 of the Cheshire East Local Plan (2017) which all require development proposals to make a positive contribution and protect or enhance the character of the settlement. It would also be contrary to Policy G2 of the Gawsorth Neighbourhood Plan (2020) and Policies GEN1, HOU 11 and HOU13 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (2022) which require good design in keeping with the character of the area.
9. The proposal would also be at odds with paragraph 135(f) of the Framework which requires the promotion of health and well-being with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users and paragraph 139 which states that development that is not well designed, particularly where it fails to reflect local design guides should be refused.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons I find that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that outweigh the harm caused by the proposal. The appeal should be dismissed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR