



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: 11 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/24/3340930

10 Brookfield Road, Comberbach, Northwich CW9 6BY

- 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 Richard Burgess against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application is Ref. 23/03701/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a first floor front extension, alterations to the front roof and door and front render.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor front extension, alterations to the front roof and door and front render at 10 Brookfield Road, Comberbach, Northwich CW9 6BY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/03701/FUL, dated 22 November 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: Elevations Drg. No1 Rev A, Floor Plan Drg.No 2 Rev A, Block Plan Dwg No 3 Rev A and Location Plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the approved plans.

Procedural Matters

2. The property is located within the Green Belt. The Council has not raised any concerns that the proposal is inappropriate development within the Green Belt. In this case I do not consider that the extension would constitute a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. Accordingly, my decision deals solely with the reason for refusal given by the Council.
3. The Council altered the description of the development. I have used the description on the decision notice as this more accurately reflect the proposal.

4. Revised plans were submitted during the course of the application and I have determined the appeal on the basis of these revised plans.

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, 10 Brookfield Road (No 10), is situated in a residential development, consisting of detached dwellings. A number of the dwellings have been extended and the area as a whole is varied in terms of the design and appearance of the dwellings.
7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings (SPD) suggests that two storey front extensions are unlikely to reflect the character and appearance of the existing building and are therefore unlikely to be supported. However, the SPD is guidance only and recognises that not all scenarios can be addressed within the guidance. In this instance the proposal would see a first-floor extension built up over an existing ground floor porch, together with alterations to the existing façade of No 10. However, the extension would not be a sizeable addition and would be well designed and in keeping with the style of the proposed front façade. The height of the eaves and roof ridge would be below the original building. In my view it would be read as a contemporary design which would define the front entrance of the dwelling.
8. Notwithstanding the resultant two storey height, due to its scale and size, the proposed first floor extension would nevertheless demonstrate an appropriate level of subservience to the existing dwelling. I noted a number of first floor front extensions, including examples of a double gable design such as that proposed, and the addition of the proposed extension would not therefore look out of place within its context. As such, the two storey element would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, nor the area.
9. The brickwork would remain the dominant material, the extent of the white render would provide a clear distinction between the old and new parts of the dwelling and would better articulate the entrance to the property. Neither would the render be at odds with neighbouring properties, where partial white render, white timber cladding and a mix of different UPVC finishes are common features found in several properties. As such, there is already some diversity in terms of the overall appearance of dwellings within the area and thus the proposal would integrate well with both the host dwelling and wider area.
10. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. As such it would be in accordance with Policies DM3 and DM21 of the Cheshire West and Chester Council Local Plan (Part 2) Local Allocations and Detailed Policies which, require amongst other things, development to respect local character and distinctiveness and to be subordinate, and in keeping, with the original dwelling and wider setting. It would not conflict with the broad aims and objectives of the guidance set out within the SPD. It would also accord with the

National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to promote development sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

11. Conditions in respect of timescale and approved plans are necessary in the interest of certainty. A condition in relation to the materials to be used is also necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR