



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 June 2024

by A Hartley, LLB(Hons), Solicitor, MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/24/3341876

1 Paul Close, Great Sankey, Warrington, WA5 3NG

- 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 & Mrs Scullion against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2023/00986/FULH
 - The development proposed is the demolition of a conservatory and the erection of a single storey rear extension partial garage conversion and loft conversion with dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Issue

2. The Appellants refer to a purported error on the submitted elevation plan 23-10052_02RevK in relation to the height of the rear single storey extension. I have only considered the submitted plans in my determination.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (i) the living conditions of neighbours at 20 and 22 Pyecroft Road and (ii) the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

4. The rear elevation of properties at 20 and 22 Pyecroft Road face the side elevation of the appeal dwelling. There is presently a separation distance of approximately 11 metres between the elevations, which is less than the 13 metres recommended in the Warrington Council Supplementary Planning Document – House Extensions (2021) (SPD) in respect of an outlook to a two-storey elevation.
5. The increase in height resulting from the proposed design of the dormer, changes to roof style, and the increased height and proximity of the rear single storey extension to the 20 Pyecroft Road boundary would cumulatively create the perception of an increased sense of enclosure on the occupants of 20 Pyecroft Road due to their orientation toward the appeal site. The proposal

therefore conflicts with Policy ENV8 of the Warrington Local Plan (2023) (LP) and the SPD in that its design results in a cumulative impact on the general levels of amenity of the neighbouring dwelling at No.20 Pyecroft Road, although it is acknowledged the harm would be marginal as the existing separation distance would not change.

6. Albeit marginally, the proposal would also be at odds with paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires the promotion of health and well-being with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users and paragraph 139 which states that development that is not well designed, particularly where it fails to reflect local design guides should be refused.

Character and Appearance

7. The appeal property is a two-storey red brick semi-detached dwelling with hipped roof. It contributes positively to the existing character of the area where semi-detached dwellings of similar design with hipped roofs predominate. This maintains symmetry and uniformity in the immediate vicinity.
8. The appeal proposal would introduce a rear dormer and convert the roof design to a straight gable. The changes to the roof design would be visible from public vantage points, including Paul Close and Pyecroft Road. The gable roof design does not respect or sustain the identified characteristics of other dwellings in the surrounding area. It disrupts the distinct pattern of hipped roofs and thus fails to make a positive contribution to local characteristics and distinctiveness. Consequently, it conflicts with policy DC6 of the LP.
9. My attention has been drawn to other examples of extensions and changes to the hipped roof style in the surrounding area. However, the critical issue in this case is the effect on the streetscene. I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits in the context of the character of its immediate vicinity.
10. I find that the potential benefits of the proposal to the living conditions of the Appellants, or to the local economy that have been brought to my attention do not outweigh the identified harms caused by the proposal.

Other Matters

11. I have considered the objections from interested parties on the impact of the proposed scheme relating to overlooking and overshadowing on properties on Pyecroft Road but due to their distance from the appeal site and the size of the dormer these impacts would be minimal.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no other material considerations including the Framework that outweigh the conflict with the development plan. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR