



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2024

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/24/3341269

2 Pulford Close, Northwich, Cheshire West and Chester, CW9 8FS

- 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 Craig Jackson against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03778/FUL dated 6 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2024.
 - The development proposed is single and first floor front extension and single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for single and first floor front extension and single storey side extension at 2 Pulford Close, Northwich, Cheshire West and Chester, CW9 8FS in accordance with the terms of the application ref: Ref 22/03778/FUL dated 6 October 2022 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission;
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan (unique plan reference #00764060-9F9994) and proposed floor plans and elevations including proposed site layout Revision A;
 - 3) The external materials used within the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling. Materials will be maintained for the lifetime of the development and any changes shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the Council's description of the development as per the decision notice as I feel it more concisely describes the revised development. I also note that the proposal was originally for a two-storey side extension and raising the ridge of the dwelling, however, revised proposals were submitted for a part single storey part two storey front extension and single storey side extension. I have determined this appeal based upon the revised plans as per the Council's assessment and decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the original dwelling, surrounding properties and wider setting of the appeal site.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two storey, detached, dwelling with a projecting garage and porch feature which stands on a corner plot between Pulford Close and Bridgemere Way. The proposal seeks to extend the host dwelling by way of a part single storey, part two storey front extension which would sit above the existing ground floor porch/garage projection. In addition, the proposal includes a single storey side extension. The Council's refusal reason is based upon both the host dwelling as well as the proposal not being in keeping with the character and appearance of surrounding properties and the wider setting of the appeal site. I note reference has been made to the neighbouring dwelling having been extended for part of its width, however within the Council's delegated report, I find that there is little evidence of reasoned assessment as to the character and appearance of surrounding properties or the wider setting of the appeal site itself.
5. I acknowledge that the Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings 2021 (SPD) outlines that extensions on corner plots are often particularly prominent and that the overarching objective, of the SPD, is to ensure appropriate extensions. It should be kept in mind that the SPD is, ultimately, guidance and taking into account the character and appearance of properties within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site I do not find that the proposals before would represent an unusual design. The features created by the proposals would be consistent with features which have been evidenced as visible on other detached properties within the immediate vicinity.
6. The front of the proposed front extension, at the roof, is lower and the gable end seeks to replicate that on a neighbouring property meaning that I do not find that the proposal would result in visual harm, nor would it be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding dwellings and the wider setting within which it would stand. The design of the proposals would, as a result of the side extension set back, avoid a wraparound scenario. In addition, I find that the proposal would, in terms of the front extension, share strong design similarities to the immediately adjacent dwelling at 4 Pulford Close. Whilst I note that the proposal would be larger, I do not find that this would automatically result in it being more prominent than the neighbouring extensions which I saw at the time of my site visit.
7. Whilst, cumulatively, the proposed extensions would be not insubstantial I find that, in this case, the proposals would be sufficiently respectful of the character and appearance of the host dwelling as well as being subordinate. Within general views of the appeal site that are available from the surrounding roads, a notable proportion of the original elevations and roof scape would remain visible with the roof pitch being specifically designed to match features of the host dwelling as well as being sufficiently set down from the ridge which assists in contributing towards a subservient appearance.
8. Overall, I find that the appeal site stands within a residential area where properties demonstrate varied character and appearance, and the design of the proposals are not uncharacteristic for the wider setting taking into account the surrounding properties. Whilst the appeal site is located on a corner plot, and such plots are typically more visually prominent, I do not find that the proposal would result in visual dominance which would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling or local area. The SPD supports the principle of a

single storey side extension if it is set 2 metres off the side boundary and, in this case, whilst the side extension is (to the rear) short of this 2 metre guidance (by 0.5 metres) I am satisfied that the proposal is still consistent with the overarching objective which seeks to make sure that such proposals make a positive contribution to the street scene as well as preventing an unbalanced appearance of existing dwellings in groups of buildings.

9. The proposal would be consistent with Cheshire West and Chester Council Local Plan Part 1 Policy ENV6 which seeks to achieve high quality design with development, where appropriate, respecting local character and achieving a sense of place through appropriate layout and design. It would also be consistent with Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan Part 2, Policy DM3 which supports design solutions that are designed to respect the scale, character and appearance of any existing building within the site and contribute positively to the character of the area and Policy DM21 which supports proposals for extensions where the resulting development is in keeping with the character and appearance of, and is subordinate to, the original dwelling and surrounding properties and the wider setting.
10. The proposal is consistent with the guidance set out within the SPD which, ultimately, seeks to achieve extensions that are sufficiently subordinate to the main dwelling in order to ensure they are in keeping with its character and appearance and that of a wider area. The proposal will also be consistent with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 which seeks to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and that will function well and add to the overall quality of an area.

Other Matters

11. I note objections to the proposal, however, these appear to have been based upon the original proposal with the Council's delegated report confirming that no new comments were received in relation to the revised plans which were consulted upon (and which are the subject of this appeal).

Conditions

12. The Council suggest three conditions within their questionnaire which I have considered and applied as appropriate. A time condition is attached to comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. A condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the approved plans is required to control and define the development which is granted consent. A materials condition is required to ensure an appropriate finish in accordance with the details submitted to match the host dwelling.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR