



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2025

by **N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/24/3355716

Badgers Cottage, Woore Road, Buerton, Cheshire East, CW3 0DG

- 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 Bladen against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/3196N.
 - The development proposed is a porch and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellants state that the originally submitted application included a balcony enclosed by a glass balustrade and served by an external spiral staircase, in addition to a fully enclosed porch and a rear extension and that these elements were removed from the proposal during the determination of the application.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a two-storey detached brick and tile dwelling. It is set back from a farm track along a further short track. A patio to the rear of the dwelling is enclosed to either side by two flanking walls connected by a timber beam.
5. The appeal property is situated in the open countryside. It appears as a converted agricultural building within predominantly agricultural land in the rural area. Its surroundings are green, open and spacious. Farm buildings are visible across fields to the east and south east of the property.
6. During my site visit I observed the appeal dwelling to be simple in appearance. Its front elevation appears functional and uncluttered, without any forward projections and there is little in the way of domestic architectural detail to significantly detract from the building's original form. The dwelling thus retains its strong agricultural character, in keeping with its surroundings.

7. The proposed porch would extend above the height of the existing windows and doorway to the front of the dwelling. It would also project forwards and this would disrupt the host dwelling's simple rectangular footprint. Together, these factors would combine to introduce a feature that would appear large and prominent against the modest original building.
8. The harm arising from this would be exacerbated as a result of the porch introducing an alien feature, the unduly domestic appearance of which would appear discordant against the agricultural simplicity of the host dwelling.
9. The proposed rear extension would infill between the two walls projecting to the rear of the dwelling. In so doing, it would introduce an area of flat roof which would itself project beyond the rear walls. This projecting area of flat roof would draw attention to itself as an addition that would be appear out of keeping with the host dwelling's agricultural character.
10. Further to the above, the proposal seeks to introduce a large new opening to what is currently a blank façade, in the form of what would appear as a large square window to the dwelling's west elevation. This would introduce a feature more akin to a domestic suburban setting than to the host dwelling's traditional agricultural form. Consequently, it would appear as a visually intrusive, discordant feature that would fail to respect the original building's agricultural form and appearance
11. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Policies SE1 and SD2 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (2017); to Policies GEN1 and RUR11 of the Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (2022); and to Policy LCD1 of the Buerton Neighbourhood Plan (2017), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

12. The appellant draws attention to support from the Parish Council, which stands in favour of the proposal. However, I have found that the proposal would result in significant harm and this is not something that is outweighed by Parish Council support.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR