



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2024

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/24/3337852

99 Carrington Close, Birchwood, Warrington WA3 7QB

- 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 and Mrs Albers against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application 2023/00847/FULH, dated 5 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is proposed front extension at first floor level over existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the determination of the planning application the Council adopted the Warrington Borough Council Local Plan 2021/22 – 2038/39 (LP) on 4 December 2023 which forms the development plan. Policy DC6 within the LP now supersedes Policy QE7 of the Warrington Borough Council Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) (CS) referenced in the Council's decision. These policies seek to ensure a quality of place, and on careful reading, the substance of LP Policy DC6 does not differ materially from CS Policy QE7. Therefore, I have not found it necessary to seek views of the respective parties, and in reaching my decision I have had regard to the relevant policy in the adopted LP.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed first floor front extension on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

4. No.99 Carrington Close (No.99) is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling, located on the north-west side of Carrington Close, a residential cul-de-sac.
5. No.99 has a broadly L-shaped building footprint, with a single-storey 'wing' projecting perpendicular to the main dwelling (so toward Carrington Close), accommodating a double garage, part of the kitchen and an entrance lobby. The proposal is to extend at first floor, over the full width of the 'wing,' projecting forward of the principal two-storey elevation of the dwelling, to provide an additional bedroom.

6. The guidance at paragraph 2.6.1 of the Council's *House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2021)* (SPD) is that front extensions should remain small so the features of the existing house are retained, should have a minimal projection and be designed so as to not appear an excessive addition.
7. I observed on my site visit that Carrington Close comprises a mix of styles of dwellings, but these are typically either modest bungalows of a simple form, or larger two-storey dwellings with an attached, or detached, single storey garage. I recognise that there is no defined building line within Carrington Close, but the gable of No.99's garage is set relatively close to the back edge of the pavement reflecting the gable of the bungalow opposite. As you enter this section of Carrington Close, the existing garage is largely hidden by the pyramid roof of the neighbours detached garage. However, from the north-east end of the cul-de-sac, the siting of No.99 and notably its garage, means it is already prominent in the streetscene.
8. Rather than a gable end (as the existing garage), the proposed first floor extension has been designed with a hipped roof. I accept that this design, combined with the reasonable set down from the main ridge of the host roof, would to a degree reduce the massing of the extension. However, the eaves would align with the existing roof and its projection of around 3.55m from the principal two-storey elevation would significantly increase the overall massing of the dwelling, and move the massing much closer to Carrington Close. When viewed from the north-east in particular, the proposed extension would appear an excessive addition what would dominate the neighbouring bungalows and wider streetscene, to the detriment of its character and appearance.
9. Therefore, in addition to the conflict with the SPD guidance, the proposed first floor extension would conflict with LP Policy DC6 which seeks to ensure proposals make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness within the surrounding area, having regards to scale, height and massing.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Jones

INSPECTOR