



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: 26 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/24/3337989

39 Mere Crescent, Oakmere, Northwich, Cheshire CW8 2HQ

- 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 Mrs Gail Holland against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref 23/02661/FUL, dated 18 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 29 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey extension to side of property
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. 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 terrace.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey dwelling forming one end of a terrace of 4 dwellings and, at the time of the site visit, some building works were being undertaken to the property. This terrace faces towards the turning area at the end of a cul-de-sac which is fronted by other terraced and semi-detached dwellings. Although the appellant has provided details of the use of render as an external material within the surrounding area, including some dwellings fronting Mere Crescent, the predominant external materials are red brick and tiles.
4. The proposed development includes a 2-storey side and rear extension together with a single storey rear extension and an enlargement of the porch which faces towards the turning head. Outbuildings within the rear garden would be removed to enable the appeal scheme to be erected.
5. By reason of the size, the scale of the resulting dwelling would not represent an overdevelopment of the property's curtilage, particularly where outbuildings would be demolished. Further, when viewed from the turning head, the height of the extension would appear a subservient addition because it would be below the ridge height of the property.
6. However, the scale and design of the proposed development would conflict with the guidance contained in the Council's *Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings* (SPD). The proposed side

extension would exceed 50 per cent of the width of the property. Although there is a modest addition at No. 33, which is the dwelling at the other end of the terrace, the scale of proposed development would unbalance the terrace's appearance.

7. Further, the proposed porch would wrap around the front and side elevations which would mean that the side extension would not appear as a separate addition. This would also conflict with the SPD's guidance. In addition, the size of the proposed porch with its rendered walls would physically and visually dominate the front elevation. Overall, and taking into account the increase in the footprint, floorspace and volume of the proposed additions, the appeal scheme would not be subservient in scale to the host property.
8. For these reasons, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the terrace and, as such, it would conflict with Policy ENV 6 of the Cheshire West and Cheshire Council Local Plan (Part One); Policies DM 3 and DM 21 of the Cheshire West and Cheshire Council Local Plan (Part Two) and the guidance contained in the SPD. Amongst other matters, these policies require high quality design with proposals being designed to respect the scale, character and appearance of any existing building within the site and contribute positively to the character of the area. Further, extensions to a dwelling house should be in keeping with the character and appearance of, and is subordinate to, the original dwelling, the surrounding properties and the wider setting. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR