



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2024

by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/24/3341806

16 Landswood Park, Hartford, Northwich CW8 1NF

- 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 Mrs Heather Colvey against the decision of Chester West and Cheshire Council.
 - The application Ref. 23/01746/FUL dated 1 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a 2 storey front extension consisting of a ground floor double garage and first floor additional bedroom, change of current white UPVC windows, soffits and fascia boards to anthracite grey UPVC.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a 2 storey front extension consisting of a ground floor double garage and first floor additional bedroom, and the change of current white UPVC windows, soffits and fascia boards to anthracite grey UPVC at 16 Landswood Park, Hartford, Northwich CW8 1NF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/01746/FUL, dated 1 June 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: Proposed Elevations View Dwg No RC041 Rev 01, Proposed Floor Plans Dwg No RC051 Rev 01, Proposed Isometric View Dwg. No RC061 Rev 01 and Site Plan.
 - 3) Other than as specified within the application form and approved plans, the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matters

2. I have used the description of the proposed development provided by the appellant on the application form in favour of that used by the Council as it provides a more accurate description of the development proposed.
3. The proposal has a number of different elements and the Council has not objected to the erection of the double garage, nor to the change in windows,

soffits and fascia boards. I shall therefore direct my assessment to the two storey extension element of the proposal.

4. Amended plans were received in the course of the application and I have had regard to these in my determination of the appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property, No 16 Landswood Park (No 16), is a two storey detached dwelling situate on a residential estate of detached properties, some of which have been extended. There is variety in the style and design of the properties along Landswood Park, and several dwellings in the immediate area have a flat roof garage which project forward of the front elevation. No 16 differs in that its existing garage is sited to the rear of the site and is notable for a front gable feature which projects towards to the road. It forms part of a line of development as the road curves around the estate. As such I do not share the view of the Council that it occupies a prominent plot, nor is it particularly dominant in views along the road.
7. The two storey front extension would be set back from the principal front gable and the roof would follow the ridge line of the existing dwelling. This would result in a double gable feature to the side elevation of No 16. This would not be a common feature within the area, nor would it reflect the design of the existing dwelling. However, there is a wide variety of design within the estate, and whilst the existing dwelling has some character it is not exceptional. Further, the double gable feature would be barely distinguishable when viewed from the front of the dwelling. Although the proposed gable end would be seen in the context of immediate views and from the neighbouring property, given the forward projections of garages and properties to the west of No 16, it would not be seen in wider views along Landswood Park. Nor given No 16's existing front gable would it be visible in views from the east. As such the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, nor the area.
8. I do not share the Council's concern that the proposed roof would be an awkward feature where it would join the original dwelling. Its pitched roof design would mirror that of, and be subservient to the roof of the existing building. Moreover, given its siting set back from the front boundary, it would have a very limited impact on the streetscene.
9. I note that the Council do not raise any concerns with regard to the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings and that no concerns are raised with regard to parking and highway issues. I agree with these assessments.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with Policy ENV6 of the Cheshire West and Chester Council Local Plan Part One: Strategic Policies and Policies DM3 and DM21 of the Cheshire West and Chester Council Local Plan Part Two: Land Allocations and Detailed Policies. Together these policies require amongst other things,

development to respect local character and distinctiveness and to be in keeping with the original dwelling and wider setting. It would not conflict with the broad guidance set out within the House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings Supplementary Planning Document. The proposal would also be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework which aims to secure development which is sympathetic and responds to local distinctiveness and character.

Conditions

11. I have attached the standard time condition and a plans condition to ensure certainty. I have also attached a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, and having taken all matters into account, I allow the appeal as set out in the formal decision above.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR