



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2024

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/24/3347229

293 Warrington Road, Warrington WA3 5LE

- 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 and Mrs C Dawson against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/00448/FULH.
 - The development is a proposed front extension to form new storage and entrance hall, with utility and wet room within existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed front extension to form new storage and entrance hall, with utility and wet room within existing house at 293 Warrington Road, Warrington WA3 5LE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2024/00448/FULH, 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: location plan and Proposed Plan and Elevations 2343-02 Rev P4.
 - 3) Prior to any above ground works taking place, full details of all external materials shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies on Warrington Road which comprises dwellings of varied design and appearance, including traditional and modern properties. Many buildings directly abut, or lie very close to, the public highway whilst others are set behind front gardens. This variety in the building line and the built form, together with gaps within the frontage offering views to the countryside beyond, give a rural village character to the immediate area.
4. The host property is one of a pair of semi-detached bungalows set behind a shared frontage which is largely given over to hard surfacing and parking. Whilst

the pair of bungalows are similar in their footprint and have a consistent pitched roof, they are not identical in their appearance as the appeal property has a predominantly rendered front elevation, whilst the attached bungalow is brick faced and contains a roller shutter door that is not present on the host property.

5. The proposed front extension would introduce a gable feature that would draw the eye and give the host property an increased visual prominence in the street scene. Nonetheless, even though it would be slightly more than a third of the width of the bungalow, due to its limited forward projection and lower ridge height and because most of the existing features would be retained, the proposed extension would appear subservient to the original dwelling. Furthermore, a roller shutter door and brick work would be included, reflecting features of the attached bungalow not currently present in the host property, ensuring that the extension would tie in with the adjoining property despite it not having a front extension.
6. Overall, the proposal would complement and harmonise with the host property and contribute to the variety within the street scene in a positive manner. In addition, it would not diminish the quality or integrity of the pair of semi-detached properties to the extent that it would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The Council does not raise concerns that the proposal would dominate the neighbouring property and adversely affect the living conditions of its occupants or would result in an unacceptable loss of parking. Based on the evidence before me, I agree. As such, and for the reasons set out above, the proposal would accord with the guidance set out in the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document.
8. Therefore, to conclude, the development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area and would accord with Policy DC6 of the Warrington Local Plan which requires development to respect, sustain and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission, I have, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, included a condition specifying the approved plans. In the interests of character and appearance, I have also imposed a condition regarding external facing materials, which is worded to require their prior approval in recognition that they do not match those of the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Elaine Moulton
INSPECTOR