



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: 30.04.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/23/3335817

10 Barrymore Road Grappenhall and Thelwall, Warrington WA4 2PZ

- 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 Chris Eyres against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/00831/FULH, dated 3 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension at 10 Barrymore Road, Grappenhall and Thelwall, Warrington WA4 2PZ in accordance with the terms of the application, 2023/00831/FULH, dated 3 July 2023, and the plans submitted with it, 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, drawing number LP-001; Block Plan, drawing number BP-001, revision B; Existing Plan & Elevations, drawing number PA-001; Proposed Plan & Elevations, drawing number PP-002, revision E.

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 and ENV8 within the LP now supersedes policies QE7 and QE6 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 provide general amenity protection. On careful reading, the substance of the new policies do not differ materially from those against which the planning application was assessed. 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 policies in the adopted LP.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed single storey extension on: (i) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene; and (ii) the living conditions of the neighbours at No.8 Barrymore Road, with regards outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. No.10 Barrymore Road (No.10) is the northerly half of a semi-detached pair of dwellings, occupying a corner plot at the junction of Barrymore Road and York Road.
5. To the side of No.10, a flat roofed garage has been added which extends up to and along the northern boundary with York Road. The garage is connected to an existing single-storey pitched roof outrigger by a covered passageway. I observed on my site visit that No.10 has a part concrete, part close-boarded timber fence along its northern boundary, but despite this the existing garage and outrigger are particularly prominent within the streetscene. It is proposed to convert the existing garage and replace the outrigger with a single storey side and rear extension. The proposed extension would project forward of the garage (towards Barrymore Road) by around 2.1m (stopping just short of an existing bay window) and then wrap around the corner, extending the full width of the dwelling to a maximum depth of around 7.1m.
6. The guidance in the Council's *House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (June 2021)* (SPD) (at paragraph 2.1.2) is that extensions should complement the existing house in terms of scale, design, roof pitch, materials and proportions, harmonise visually with the existing dwelling and wider area, and be subordinate in scale to the building which is to be extended.
7. Although increasing its length on the northern boundary, the proposed extension would have a simple flat roof design finished in reclaimed Cheshire brick, with sandstone coping stones on top of a parapet with a height of only around 3.2m. Consistent with the SPD guidance, it would not therefore appear disproportionate to the principal two-storey dwelling and, by removing the existing outrigger, it would result in a cohesive composition to the rear elevation, sympathetic to, and visually harmonising with, its host.
8. I observed on my site visit that both York Road and Barrymore Road are mixed in character, comprising differing styles of housing including modest, simple pitched roof bungalows, larger semi-detached two-storey dwellings (with attic accommodation), with facing gables, and detached dwellings with a hipped or pitched roof (or combination). It is accepted that because of its corner plot, the proposed extension to No.10 would be prominent, and a flat roof is not a particular characteristic of the area. However, again, its simple form and fenestration details means it would not appear an incongruous addition in the context of the mixed character of the streetscene described.
9. I therefore conclude on the first main issue that the proposed extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or wider streetscene. Consequently, there would be no conflict with the SPD guidance or 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.

Living conditions

10. The guidance at paragraph 2.2.1 of the SPD states that the Council use a well-established 45 degree code to assess impact on neighbouring properties and, to comply, extensions should not cross the 45 degree line taken in a horizontal plane and measured from the centre point of the neighbour's nearest primary habitable room window. There is no dispute between the parties that the proposed single-storey rear extension would be in breach of this guidance in respect of the windows to the rear elevation of the attached neighbour at No.8 Barrymore Road (No.8). I also observed on my site visit that No.8 itself has a hipped roof outrigger with a north facing window, so directly toward the common boundary with No.10. Although the proposed single storey rear extension would be only a maximum 3.2m (to the top of the parapet), it would be above the common boundary and, despite the mature hedgerow, would result in some loss of outlook from these windows. There would, therefore, be a conflict with the SPD guidance and LP Policy ENV8 in so far as it requires consideration of the need to respect the living conditions of existing neighbouring residential occupiers in relation to outlook.
11. However, the Council have previously determined that Prior Approval was not required (ref. 2023/00072/HPA) for a single storey extension, which would project a maximum of 6m from the principal rear elevation of No.10 (the PA scheme). The appellant has submitted in evidence the Proposed Plans and Elevations for the PA scheme which show a flat roof single storey extension which, as the appeal proposal, would extend up to and 6m along the common boundary with No.8. The appeal proposal differs (on this boundary) in that the corner closest to the common boundary is chamfered (returning 45 degrees off the boundary), and then the extension projects a further 1.2m (so a maximum 7.2m). Despite the greater overall depth, the chamfered design means there would be with no discernible difference in the outlook from the rear windows of No.8, when compared to the PA scheme.
12. It seems to me a realistic and likely possibility that the PA scheme described above would be built if the appeal were dismissed and if so, it would have an equal (and no greater) impact on the outlook from the windows to the rear of No.8. This is a genuine fallback position to which, in this case, I afford significant weight such that it outweighs the conflict with LP Policy ENV8 above.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in order to provide certainty. Because the proposed materials, namely reclaimed Cheshire brick, sandstone coping stones and black powder coated aluminium doors, are specified on the drawings it is not necessary to also impose a condition requiring materials to match the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR