



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/24/3354509

23 Price Avenue, Sandbach, Cheshire East, CW11 4BN

- 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 Marcin Garnowski against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/2582C.
 - The development proposed is a double-storey side extension and new external wall insulation to the existing property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The original application was for a proposed development which, amongst other things, sought to extend the appeal dwelling to the shared boundary with Number 21 Price Avenue. The proposal was amended further to advice from the Council and consequently, the proposal the subject of the appeal before me proposes an extension that would leave a gap to the shared boundary and which would be set-back a short distance from the host dwelling's front elevation.

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 is a two-storey semi-detached brick-built dwelling. It is located in a residential area characterised by the presence of two-storey detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings.
5. Dwellings in the area are set back from the road behind parking areas and/or gardens and have gardens to the rear. The setting back of dwellings combines with the presence of gaps between dwellings, pairs of dwellings and terraced rows to provide for a spacious character.
6. Further, the common use of red brick and the presence of pitched and hipped roofs on semi-detached and terraced dwellings, together with the repetition of design features, provides the area with an attractive sense of uniformity.

7. The hipped roofs and side porches of the appeal dwelling and its attached neighbour, Number 25 Price Avenue, combine with the proportions and brickwork of each dwelling to provide for a significant sense of symmetry. In addition, the original form of the hipped roofs appear in keeping with and contribute to, the traditional roofscape and uniform qualities of the area, respectively.
8. A two-storey side extension is proposed. This would extend the appeal dwelling close to the boundary with Number 21 Price Avenue. The side elevation would have a gable-end and the proposed ridge line would not be set down from, but would extend at the same height as, the original roof.
9. As a consequence, the proposal would result in the development of a roof that would not appear in keeping with its surroundings. Rather, it would appear as a highly incongruous feature, in stark contrast to the hipped roof of the attached dwelling, No 25, as well as that of the appeal dwelling's other immediate neighbour, No 21.
10. Further to the above, the introduction of the gable roof and large side extension as proposed would severely unbalance the sense of symmetry between the appeal dwelling and its attached neighbour, as well as detract from the area's uniform qualities.
11. Also, the design and overall scale of the proposal would result in it drawing attention to itself as a large, bulky and unduly dominant feature. The proposal would thus fail to appear as a subordinate addition – a factor not mitigated to any significant degree by the proposed slight set back from the front elevation and modest step-in from the shared boundary with No 21.
12. In addition, I find that, as a consequence of its overall height, bulk and siting, the proposal would result in the remaining gap between Nos 23 and 21 appearing unduly narrow. This would be to the detriment of the area's spacious qualities.
13. 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 SD1, SD2 and SE1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (2017); to Policies GEN1 and HOU13 of the Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (2022); and to Policy H2 of the Sandbach Neighbourhood Development Plan (2022), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conclusion

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

N McGurk

INSPECTOR