



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 June 2024 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MRTPI MIEMA CEnv

### Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) Dip TP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 July 2024

---

### Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/24/3340583

### 34 Jackson Avenue, Woolston, Warrington, Cheshire WA1 3LT

- 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 P Melvin against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
- The application Ref 2023/01250/FULH.
- The development proposed is a two-storey front extension.

---

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.
3. Since the application was determined, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 19 December 2023. However, as any policies that are material to this decision have not fundamentally changed, I am satisfied that this has not prejudiced any party. I have had regard to the latest version of the Framework in reaching my decision.

### Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host building, and the street scene.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on a corner plot at the junction of Jackson Avenue and Wilkinson Avenue in Warrington. The surrounding area is residential and is characterised by symmetrically paired semi-detached dwellings with hipped roofs, constructed with red brick material, which feature two-storey bay windows to the front elevation. The bay windows are either rectangular and shared across the pair or half hexagonal and individual.
6. The appeal property is symmetrically paired with No.32 Jackson Avenue with a shared rectangular two storey bay. It features a large two-storey side extension which is flush to the original front elevation and includes a two-storey bay window projection with a small gable roof which pitches above the eaves.

7. The proposed two storey front extension would be positioned between the original bay window and bay window projection of the side extension. It would project forward of the original front wall and shared bay window significantly and thereby breach the front building line formed with No.32. This would be contrary to guidance within Warrington Borough Council's House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document, June 2021 (the SPD) which advises that for a semi-detached house, an extension to the front may harm the appearance of the balanced pair. The SPD continues by stating that any extension to the front should have a minimal projection and respect any building line with neighbouring properties. The SPD also advises that any extension to the front elevation must be designed to tie in with the existing property and not appear as an excessive addition in terms of height, projection, or width.
8. By virtue of its size, projection, and siting, the proposed two storey front extension would significantly unbalance the pair with resultant harm to the appearance of the group. The appeal property occupies a prominent position at the street junction and thus the proposal would be highly visible within the street scene. It would appear as a dominant and excessive addition which would not be subservient as an extension and would detract from the host dwelling and the contribution it makes to the quality of the street scene within its symmetrical pair.
9. I acknowledge the appellant's submission that many houses on Jackson Avenue have been previously extended in one form or another, including the appeal property. Nevertheless, my observation upon my visit to the site is that these extensions are small when compared with the appeal proposal and do not significantly disrupt the symmetry of pairs of properties, which is a predominant and established feature of the character of the area.
10. I have also had regard to the impact that the previous extensions have had on the original property. I find that the proposal coupled with these existing extensions would further exacerbate the visual impact and make the extent of development appear even more excessive. I am not persuaded that being set further back than other properties on the street lessens the prominence of the site at a street junction.
11. I find that the proposal would be harmful to the appearance of the host property and would be an incongruous addition which would be harmful to the character of the street scene. Consequently, it would be contrary to the aims of Policy DC6 of Warrington Borough Council's Local Plan Core Strategy (Adopted July 2014) and the SPD. These amongst other matters seek to ensure that proposals for new development respect, sustain and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness within the surrounding area, having regard to scale, height and massing.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu*

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

**Inspector's Decision**

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence, and my representative's report, and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*Martin Seaton*

INSPECTOR