



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2024

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/24/3340757

11 Brookfield Road, Comberbach, Northwich CW9 6AZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Richard Major against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/04006/FUL.
 - The development is the erection of a first floor addition to the front/side and 2 storey to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first floor addition to the front/side and 2 storey to the front at 11 Brookfield Road, Comberbach, Northwich CW9 6AZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/04006/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; GDS 2625 Rev D; GDS 2626 Rev D and GDS 2627 Rev D.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached dwelling situated within a residential area which includes a mix of dwelling types and designs, including bungalows and 2-storey houses. Generally, the dwellings are set back from the footways to the rear of front gardens which are landscaped and used for parking. This siting and detached nature of the dwellings gives the streetscene a spacious appearance. There are variations in the orientation of these dwellings to the roads with a mix of eaves and gables facing the road. From what was observed during the site visit, some of the dwellings have been altered, including front extensions of varying sizes and designs. There is no consistency of design albeit brick walls and tiled roofs are the predominant external materials.
4. The development includes a front extension which, as the council describe, is a double gable design. The planning history set out by the Planning Officer identifies that the front extension which has been erected is a hybrid of 2

previously approved schemes (14/3115/FUL and 23/02653/FUL). There is no suggestion from the council that these independent schemes could not still be implemented if this appeal fails and, as such, they are given significant weight in the determination of this appeal. These schemes would materially alter the character and appearance of the property.

5. However, since the first permission the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (LP) has been adopted and the council has published its Supplementary Planning Document *House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings* (SPD). The SPD refers to 2-storey front extensions being unlikely to reflect the character and appearance of the existing building and are, therefore, unlikely to be supported. However, the SPD is guidance and, as such, it cannot reflect all the circumstances of a particular scheme.
6. In this case, there is no clear continuity of design associated with the dwellings within the surrounding area, including their front elevations. As the appellant identifies, and were observed during the site visit, there are other dwellings within the surrounding area which have either a similarly designed double gable or a large gable projection facing towards the roads.
7. For these reasons, the property, as it has already been altered, is neither a conspicuous nor incongruous addition to the streetscene and does not detract from the spacious character and appearance of the surrounding residential area. Instead, the resulting property visually respects the local character and appearance of the surrounding area and the development is visually and physically subordinate to the original host property. This assessment takes into account the fallback position whereby a large front gable extension could still be erected
8. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the development does not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it does not conflict with LP Policies ENV2, DM3 and DM21 and the guidance contained in the SPD. Amongst other matters, these policies require alterations to existing dwellings to result in a development which is in keeping with the character and appearance of, and is subordinate to, the original dwelling and surrounding developments. Any development should also be of high quality design, respect local character and protect the visual amenity of the local area.

Conditions

9. The council has suggested a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans. For reasons of precision about what has been approved, such a condition is necessary. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR