



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2024

by K Winnard LL.B Solicitor (Hons)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/24/3352547

26 Meadowside Drive, Henhull, Nantwich CW5 6YG

- 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 Barry Cason against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/1526N
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to the side of the dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. In December 2024, the Government published its revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a cause of action.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 26 Meadowside Drive, (No 26) is a detached dwelling situate on a prominent corner plot on a recently built residential development. At this point Meadowside Drive turns almost 90° in a southerly direction such that both the northern and eastern elevations of No 26 front the road. The immediate area is characterised by open landscaped and amenity areas which contribute positively to the overall character and appearance of the area. Whilst there has been an increase in hardstanding off street parking areas with an associated loss of garden space along this part of Meadowside Drive, the general landscape design and set back of the dwellings from the highway ensures that a sense of spaciousness is still retained which gives the street an attractive open quality.
5. The proposed extension would project from the side elevation of the dwelling onto the open lawned grass area to the side of No 26 fronting the cul de sac. Notwithstanding the curvature of the street and the building line of the dwellings

fronting it, the proposal would interrupt the existing pattern of development found on Meadowside Drive. It would bring the dwelling closer to the highway and would result in a reduction in the spaciousness to the side of the dwelling. Consequently, it would create a visually conspicuous feature on this prominent corner plot, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

6. I appreciate that the properties at the far southern end of the cul de sac are close to the road frontage. However, these properties are sufficiently set back so as not to disrupt the views of the continuity of the open frontages when seen from this end of the cul de sac. A landscaping scheme as proposed by the appellant would serve to provide further greenery and would screen some views of the development. However, the lack of built development on the open frontages is discernible and the proposal would disrupt the visual continuity of these frontages. Notwithstanding the screening, as a result of its siting on a prominent corner plot, the development would be readily visible in views from Meadowside Drive and the surrounding area.
7. I also note the % reduction in the amount of grassed area available as a result of the proposal. However, I do not agree that the land is a wasted unusable space. It is an open lawned area which provides a valuable visible amenity space within a residential area. As such, it contributes positively to the overall character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposal would provide additional and reconfigured living accommodation for the appellant and their family and I note the comments regarding the constraints of the ground floor accommodation. I note too that the proposal would not result in the loss of parking space provision, nor are any concerns expressed in relation to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. However these are not matters which outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area. Whilst the appellant refers to the development as being sustainable, the Framework also requires development to add to the overall quality of the area and to be sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.
9. Therefore I conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such the proposal would be contrary to Policies SD1, SD2 and SE1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030, Policies GEN1 and HOU11 of the Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Policies Document and Policy DEV1 of the Acton, Edleston and Henhull Neighbourhood Plan. Together these policies seek to reinforce local character and for development to be in keeping with the character and appearance of their surroundings.
10. For the reasons given, I hereby dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR