



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2025

by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/24/3355583

51 Pelham Road, Grappenhall and Thelwall, Warrington WA4 2HA.

- 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 Steven Pilkington against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/01118/FULH
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension at 51 Pelham Road, Grappenhall and Thelwall, Warrington WA4 2HA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2024/01118/FULH, dated 3 September 2024, and the plans submitted with it, 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 plans: Proposed Plans, Elevations and Site Plan DWG 02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

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.
3. The development consists of a single storey rear extension and a two storey side extension. The Council's concern relates to the latter part of the development and I shall accordingly direct my assessment to this part of the development within my decision below.
4. The decision notice refers to the impact of the development as a result of its proximity to the boundary of No 1 Buntingford Road (No 1). However, from the information before me and my observations on the site visit, the property closer to

the side boundary with the appeal property is No 3 Buntingford Road. I have taken the reference to No 1 to be an error and have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property, No 51 Pelham Road, (No 51), is a semi detached property in a residential area where the predominant form is of semi- detached dwellings in an uniform style laid out in a regular pattern set back from the road. Due to its siting close to the junction with Buntingford Road, No 51 shares a common boundary with Nos 1 and 3 Buntingford Road which lie at right angles to No 51. A garage at No 3 Buntingford Road (No 3) lies directly adjacent to the site boundary with No 51.
7. The proposed two storey side extension would be sited close to the shared boundary with No 3 and as such would be closer than the one metre separation gap to the side boundary recommended within the Council's House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (June 2021) 2.1.1 Space around Dwellings (SPD). The guidance indicates that the aim of this requirement is to avoid any potential terracing effect with the neighbouring property. This would not be the case in this instance given that No 3 is located on a corner plot at a 90° angle to the appeal property. As such, any future potential side extension to No 3 would not adjoin the side boundary with No 51.
8. The SPD also aims to ensure the retention of space between and around houses and that proposals should respect the space around the house to be extended. I note the Council's concern that the proposed extension would appear cramped in design and layout. However, the new front extension would be set back from the front elevation and set down from the ridgeline of the existing dwelling. Adequate space would remain in front of the dwelling and overall the proposal would relate well to the host dwelling. Notwithstanding that it would be adjacent to the garage at No 3, the proposal would be seen within the context of the corner plot at No 3 and space at the front of No 51 which provide a sense of openness at this location. Nos 51 and 3 would still be viewed in the local street scene as separate, distinct dwellings. As such the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the appearance of the area.
9. I note that the Council raises no concern with regard to the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, nor that there are any issues in relation to parking provision. I would agree with these assessments.
10. I find that the appeal proposal is acceptable and would not harm the appearance of the streetscene and wider area. Accordingly it would not conflict with Policy DC6 of the Warrington Local Plan (adopted December 2023), which requires good design to be at the core of development proposals and to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. Nor would it conflict with the overall aims set out in the SPD in relation to visual amenity.

Conditions

11. I have included conditions relating to implementation and approved plans for certainty. I have also included a condition in relation to matching materials in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I hereby allow the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR