
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/R0660/D/24/3339988

57 Delamere Road, Nantwich, Cheshire CW5 7DF

- 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 D McKown against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 23/4018N, dated 24 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey extension to side, new dropped kerb and parking spaces to front.
-

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 streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling sited at the junction of Delamere Road and Parkfield Drive. The property is orientated with its front door facing towards Delamere Road and there is a substantial hedge which comprises the boundary to Parkfield Drive. There is an open gap between the property's current side elevation and the boundary hedge abutting Parkside Drive.
5. The surrounding residential development is principally characterised by detached and semi-detached 2-storey houses and bungalows of varying designs. However, these dwellings are generally set back a similar distance from the footways along the road to the rear of open front gardens which are landscaped and used for off-street parking.
6. At road junctions, the flank walls of dwellings are set back from the side boundaries to reflect the depth of the adjoining front gardens. This applies to the appeal property's side elevation which reflects the siting of the front elevations of 20 to 26 Parkfield Drive. The same applies on the opposite side of the road where the 2-storey flank wall of 1 Pine Walk reflects the building

- line of 15 to 25 Parkfield Drive. Similar relationships exist for the dwellings sited at the near-by junction of Delamere Road and Marlowe Drive.
7. The proposed development includes the erection of a 2-storey side extension which would be subordinate in scale and design to the host property and could be erected of matching external materials. By reason of siting, the appeal scheme would be set back from the footway of Delamere Road to the same extent as the property and other dwellings fronting this road, particularly Nos. 43 to 55.
 8. However, because of the property's siting at the road junction, the proposed development would project forward of the building line associated with Nos. 20 to 26. The open gap between the current side elevation and the boundary hedge would be significantly reduced by the siting of the proposed extension. This projection beyond the established building line and the 2-storey height of the proposed extension would cause both the appeal scheme and resulting property to be an unduly prominent feature within the streetscene along Parkside Drive. The appeal scheme would fail to respect the character and appearance of the streetscene and the siting of other dwellings at nearby road junctions.
 9. Reference has been made by the appellant to other schemes whereby extensions have been granted planning permission for dwellings sited on corner plots. However, the full planning circumstances of these other schemes have not been provided and they are located away from the appeal property. Further, based upon the details which are available, these permissions were granted before the adoption of the current policies in the Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Plan Document (SADPD). Limited weight is, therefore, given to these other schemes in the determination of this appeal.
 10. The appellant has also identified that the proposed development would result in an improved level of family accommodation. This improvement to the accommodation is not, however, outweighed by the unacceptable harm which has been identified, even when taken together with the limited weight given to the other extension schemes.
 11. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the streetscene and, as such, it would conflict with SADPD Policies GEN 1 and HOU 11 and Policies SD 2 and SE 1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELPS). In addition to general requirements for development to be of a high quality of design and be appropriate to the local context, these policies also refer to extensions to dwellings should be in keeping with the scale, character and appearance of their surroundings. CELPS Policy SD 1 is not considered to be of direct relevance to domestic extensions because it is concerned with the wider principle of sustainable development. However, this does not outweigh the unacceptable harm which has been identified and, accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR