



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2024

by R Morgan BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/24/3345901

31 Altrincham Road, Wilmslow, SK9 5NG

- 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 Sebastian Garcia Watson against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/4654M.
 - The development proposed is ground floor rear and side extension with first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Although not mentioned in the description of development above, (which is taken from the application form), the plans include a second-floor extension. I have assessed the proposal on the basis of the submitted drawings, which include that element of the scheme.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal concerns a traditional semi-detached house, within a row of similar properties fronting onto Altrincham Road. The houses are of a simple yet attractive design, with slate-roofed front bays; brick detailing around the windows and doors, and distinctive, slender chimneys.
5. From the rear garden of 31 Altrincham Road (No. 31), it is evident that many of the nearby properties have been extended, in a variety of ways. However, this has generally been achieved in a manner which is not obvious from the street. Indeed, when viewed from Altrincham Road, the row of houses appears relatively unaltered, save for changes to the windows and doors. Because of their appearance, the appeal property and its immediate neighbours contribute positively to the character of the area.
6. The pairs of semis along this part of Altrincham Road are sited fairly close together, and this restricts views of the sides and rear of the houses from the street. Even so, the main side elevations of the buildings can be clearly seen, revealing the pitched form of the main roofs, with deep eaves. The consistency

of roof shape forms an important part of the character of the properties along this row.

7. The elevation plans show that additional living space at second floor level would be created by extending the existing side wall at No. 31. The plans appear to show that the rear facing main roof would be completely removed, replaced with a new flat roofed element, at full ridge height.
8. These proposed changes to the side wall and roof would be clearly visible from the street, even if only in glimpsed views. The change to the roof form and profile, combined with the proposed use of brick as a facing material, would give the impression of a three-storey building. This would appear out of place here, and would detract from the character of the house itself, and the uniformity of the wider row.
9. Other houses of a similar age and style nearby have roof extensions, including the immediately adjacent property, 33 Altrincham Road, and numbers 78, 80, 84 and 88 just across the road. However, unlike the development proposed here, those additions take the form of box dormers which are set in from the main ridge and roof edge. By leaving the side and eaves of the roof intact, the original two-storey form of those buildings, with their characteristic roof shapes, can still be clearly appreciated from the street.
10. In addition, the choice of grey materials used in the neighbouring box dormer reinforces the impression of a two-storey building with a roof extension, rather than a house with three storeys as would be the case at No. 31. For these reasons, the nearby examples differ from the proposed development.
11. There are inaccuracies in the submitted plans, and the omission of the chimney on the front facing elevation from both existing and proposed plans may be an oversight. Either way, retention of the chimney would help to preserve the original character of the appeal property, and the wider row of houses.
12. The proposed ground and first floor extensions would be of an appropriate scale, design and appearance. These additions would be visible from surrounding gardens, but would be seen in the context of other houses which have been extended and altered at the rear.
13. The ground and first floor elements of the scheme would be acceptable. However, for the reasons set out above, the design of the proposed second storey extension would result in harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property, and the wider row of houses.
14. The appeal proposal would fail to protect or enhance the built environment, and would not contribute positively to the area's character, quality or distinctiveness. As a result, it would not comply with Policies SD1, SD2 or SE1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2017. For similar reasons, it would fail to comply with the design principles and requirements for extensions and alterations set out in Policies GEN1 and HOU11 of the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document 2022.
15. In its decision notice, the Council has also referred to the Cheshire East Design Guide, but has not explained why the proposal does not comply with this document, or provided a copy. I am therefore unable to comment further.

Conclusion

16. I have found that the proposed second storey extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and wider area. It would conflict with the development plan, and no other considerations outweigh this. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR