



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2024

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26th April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/24/3337211

38 Higher Downs, Knutsford, Cheshire WA16 8AS

- 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 Stephen Tyler against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 23/3461M, dated 12 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a double storey side extension, single storey rear extension, front porch addition and dwelling surface treatments.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The amendments of the National Planning Policy Framework were published in December 2023 after the appeal application was determined. These amendments do not alter the basis upon which this appeal has been assessed.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a bungalow with accommodation within the roofspace and is sited at a junction between Higher Downs and a service road which serves several dwellings. The character and appearance of the streetscene along Higher Downs is open and verdant because the dwellings are set back from the main carriageway to the rear of front gardens, service roads and grass verges of varying depths which include street trees.
5. Some of the dwellings adjacent to the property have been altered, including an extension at 36 Higher Downs which has created a 2-storey dwelling from a bungalow of a similar design as the property. Other dwellings have retained their flat roof single storey garages and these are a common feature within the streetscene along Higher Downs.
6. The appeal scheme includes the demolition of the property's existing single storey flat roof garage and its replacement by a 2-storey extension and the erection of a single storey rear addition. The Council has not objected to the rear addition. Although in keeping with the size of No. 36, the scale of the proposed side extension, together with lack of a subservient design, such as a

lower ridge height, would mean that this element of the appeal scheme would not be subordinate to the size and character of the existing property.

7. The proposed 2-storey side extension would be of a similar scale and design as the extension at No. 36. However, No. 36 is sited away from the main carriageway and footway of Higher Downs to the rear of a wide grass verge and service road. It is not a prominent feature within the streetscene along Higher Downs whereas because of the property's siting at the junction the proposed side extension would be highly visible from either direction along the main carriageway and footways. This element of the appeal scheme, together with the scale and massing of the resulting property, would be visually prominent within the streetscene rather than respect its open and verdant character and appearance.
8. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it would conflict with Policies SD 2 and SE 1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS); Policies GEN 1 and HOU 11 of the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document and Policy D2 of the Knutsford Neighbourhood Plan. In addition to general requirements for development to be of a high quality of design and be appropriate to, and commensurate with, local context, these policies refer to extensions to dwellings being in keeping with the scale, character and appearance of their surroundings and be subordinate to the existing dwelling.
9. CELPS Policy MP 1 is a generic policy concerning the presumption in favour of sustainable development rather than a detailed development management policy concerning domestic extensions. However, this matter does not alter the conclusion that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR