



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

Decision date: 26th April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/24/3336757

7 Castleford Drive, Prestbury, Macclesfield, Cheshire SK10 4BG

- 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 Jamie Lyon against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0266M, dated 20 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension and two storey front remodel with single storey garage addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two storey side extension and two storey front remodel with single storey garage addition at 7 Castleford Drive, Prestbury, Macclesfield, Cheshire SK10 4BG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/0266M, dated 20 January 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: Location Plan; 22-57-00-001 R1; 22-57-00-002; 22-57-00-003 R1; 22-57-00-004 R1; 22-57-20-001 R7; 22-57-20-002 R7; 22-57-20-003 R3; 22-57-20-004 R3 and 22-57-20-006 R2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The amendments of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 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 surrounding area, including the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached dwelling sited on a wide plot which is situated within a primarily residential area comprising a mix of dwelling types, designs and sizes. Some of the dwellings possess prominent entrance features, such as large porches, and others have been altered by the erection of a variety of different types of extensions. The property has a wide front entrance comprising double doors.
5. There is no unifying rhythm associated with the design of the dwellings fronting Castleford Drive other than they are set back from the road to the rear of landscaped front gardens also used for parking. The external materials are mainly brick walls and concrete tiled roofs. There is a predominance of gable roofs albeit there are some limited examples of hipped roofs, including the side extension at 11 Castleford Drive. Although making a modest contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the property is not of such high design quality that it needs to be retained in its current form to maintain any distinctive rhythm or pattern of development associated with the dwellings fronting Castleford Drive.
6. To the east of the property is an open area which contains a number of mature trees that partially screen the property's flank wall and provide an open and verdant character to this particular part of the streetscene. There is part of the garden between the flank wall and the recently planted shared boundary with this open area. The proposed development includes the erection of a 2-storey side extension on the garden between the property's flank wall and the shared boundary with the open area. Although sited closer to the open space, the proposed side elevation of the resulting property would still be set back from the boundary.
7. Together with the alterations to the front elevation, including the front entrance door, the proposed extension would result in a change to the character and appearance of the property when viewed from the road. The resulting property would have a symmetrical appearance with 2-storey gables at either end possessing hipped rather than gable roof forms. No other dwellings of a symmetrical appearance with a hipped roof form were observed during the site visit.
8. However, these design matters alone are not a reason for this appeal failing. The appeal scheme would still result in a high quality design of dwelling which would be sympathetic to, rather than disrupting, the character and appearance of the surrounding dwellings, including those properties fronting Castleford Drive where there are variations in their form and design.
9. The resulting property would still be sited to the rear of the current front garden. Although smaller in width, a transition between the enlarged property and the open space would be maintained by the flank wall still being sited away from the shared boundary and the hipped roof sloping away from the boundary. Accordingly, the open and verdant character of the streetscene associated with the open space would be maintained rather than be significantly harmed by the appeal scheme.
10. There would be an increase in the footprint and width of the property. However, the appeal scheme would not result in an overdevelopment of the plot thereby appearing a cramped form of development. The resulting property

would sit comfortably within the existing spacious curtilage. As identified by the appellant, the ratio between the enlarged property's footprint and the size of the curtilage would be similar to other dwellings within the surrounding area.

11. Although the roof would not be set down below the current ridge, the size of the proposed extension would be subservient in scale to the host property. In any event, even if the proposed extension was not subservient in scale, the appeal scheme would result in a design and size of property that would not cause material harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene for the reasons given. The existing double door entrance to the property would be visually maintained by the proposed remodelling of the front elevation which would also include additional openings at first floor level.
12. Overall, the design of the resulting property would make a similar contribution to the streetscene as the existing property, subject to securing external materials matching those of the host property in the event this appeal succeeds. This is to be preferred to the rendered walls originally indicated on the application form.
13. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, including the streetscene, and, as such, there would not be a conflict with Policies SD 2 and SE 1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy and Policies GEN 1 and HOU 11 of the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document. In addition to general requirements for development to be of a high quality of design and be appropriate to the local context, these policies require extensions to dwellings to be in keeping with the scale, character and appearance of their surroundings and the local area and be subordinate to the existing dwelling.
14. The appeal scheme would also accord with the guidance contained in the *Prestbury Village Design Statement* which refers to extensions not increasing the size of buildings to such an extent that they overdevelop the site and have an adverse impact on the open and semi-rural character of the Parish. Extensions must also respect the existing scale of the building.

Conditions

15. The Council has suggested several conditions in the event this appeal succeeds which have been assessed against the tests in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. For reasons of clarity, a condition is necessary to secure the erection of the proposed extension in accordance with the approved drawings. To assist with the assimilation of the appeal scheme into the surrounding area a condition for the external materials to match those of the property is necessary.
16. For the reasons given, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR