



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 04 July 2024

**by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 25<sup>TH</sup> July 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/24/3343304**

**Eastfield, Barton Road, Farndon, Chester CH3 6NL**

- 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 Jeanette Dennett against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
  - The application Ref is 23/03650/FUL.
  - The development proposed is described as a bedroom extension and en-suite above existing attached garage.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
  - a) the living conditions of the occupiers of Whitehaven, with particular regard to loss of light and outlook; and,
  - b) the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

### Reasons

#### *Living Conditions*

3. Whitehaven is located adjacent to the appeal site and has a first-floor window within its side elevation. It is understood that this window serves a habitable room, and is the only opening serving that room. To the side of Whitehaven is a garden, which creates a degree of separation between the properties.
4. The proposed extension would bring development closer to the window at first floor level, albeit the additional projection towards the dwelling is not significant. The position of the window, high up in the elevation, would mean that the shadow cast on the window from the closer proximity of built form would not be significant. In addition, the orientation of the properties would mean that any additional loss of light to the window would likely be limited to early parts of the day only. Therefore, I do not find that the extension would result in an unacceptable loss of light to the window.
5. The existing outlook from the window is towards the flank elevation of the appeal site, which includes a two-storey gable positioned behind the gable of the garage. Therefore, the existing two storey development is set away from the boundary. Notwithstanding the set back at first floor, and the spacing

created by the garden, the existing dwelling is likely to be a prominent feature in views from the window.

6. The extension would bring development close to the boundary, over two-storeys. The extension would project further to the rear at first floor level than existing. The height and additional first floor depth, would result in a large expanse of brickwork close to the side boundary. This would result in a greater sense of enclosure, with the extension appearing as a dominant feature in views from the window, resulting in a poor outlook. I acknowledge that the outlook would retain views over the existing garden. However, these views would be against the backdrop of a large gable which would be dominant and oppressive feature in the view.
7. For the above reasons, the proposed extension would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of Whitehaven, with particular regard to loss of outlook. Therefore, the development conflicts with Policy SOC5 of the of the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan Part One: Strategic Policies (SP); Policies DM2 and DM21 of the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan Part Two: Land Allocations and Detailed Policies (LADP), and the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (the Framework). Together, amongst other things, these seek to resist development which has an unacceptable effect on living conditions, including outlook. The development would also conflict with the general principles of the Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings (2021) (the SPD), which seeks to ensure that the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties is protected.

#### *Character and Appearance*

8. Eastfield is a two-storey, detached dwelling with a prominent projecting gable to its roadside elevation. Single storey projections are located to the side and front. These have a gable roof design to the side, with wraparound lean-to roof to the front, and a gable over the porch. The dwelling is set back from Barton Road, behind a driveway and front garden, although it is sited slightly forward of Whitehaven. The surrounding area is residential in character and consists predominantly of two-storey detached dwellings of varying design and age. The surrounding context along this part of Barton Road is one of variety.
9. The proposed extension would be modest in width, and would be constructed over the existing garage. The extension would be flush with the existing first floor, and would include a ridge height that would match the existing. Notwithstanding this, the extension would sit behind the existing two-storey front gable and the single storey forward projections. These forward projections would remain dominant, and would ensure that the extension could be provided without disrupting the existing form or visually competing with the main architectural features. Therefore, while no set back or set down is provided, the dwelling could accommodate the relatively modest extension without it being overwhelmed or subsumed by it.
10. The surrounding area is one of variety. The extension would be provided to the side of the dwelling and set back from Barton Road. The set back of the dwelling would ensure that the side extension would not be prominent in the streetscene. When approaching from the west, the side elevation would be visible due to variations in the building line, although from most aspects it

would be partially screened by Whitehaven. In any event, the extension would be viewed against a street scene which has significant variation in design. The lack of any uniformity in the area means that the extension could be provided without appearing out of context with its surroundings.

11. For the above reasons, the proposed extension would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building or surrounding area. Therefore, the development complies with Policy ENV6 of the SP; Policies DM3 and DM21 of the LADP, and the Framework. Together, amongst other things, these seek to deliver development which is of high-quality design, that respects local character. The development would also comply with Policy 3.2 of the Farndon Neighbourhood Development Plan (2018), which seeks to ensure that the character of the village is not significantly changed by development.
12. The development would not adhere to the specific guidance for side extensions set out in the Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings (2021) (the SPD). However, I am mindful that this is only guidance and the SPD confirms that each proposal will be considered on its merits, as I have done in this instance.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

*D Cleary*

INSPECTOR