



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2025

by Eleni Marshall BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/25/3360807

**316 Manchester Road, Lostock Gralam, Northwich, Cheshire West and Chester,
CW9 7PY**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Oliver Rose against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application reference is 24/01426/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of a detached garage and garden room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I note that, since its original submission, the proposal was amended in terms of overall intended use, so I have utilised the Council's description of the proposal as I find that it more concisely describes the proposal upon which a determination was made as well as being the basis for the revised plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the wider setting of the site.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling which stands in a long plot. The proposal that is before me seeks permission for the erection of a detached garage and garden room which would be located at the far end of the appeal site away from the host dwelling. As noted above, within procedural matters, the proposed use of the appeal proposal has been amended during the course of the original application. Whilst I acknowledge the amendment to the proposed use of the building the revised drawings before me do not show a reduction, to the physical scale of the proposal, to that which was originally submitted.
5. The proposed building would have a footprint which would be in the region of 89 sq./m. I find that the footprint of the proposal would not be dissimilar to the footprint of the host dwelling itself and, combined with its proposed location at the furthest end of the appeal site from the host dwelling, the proposal does not appear to have been designed to be closely related to the host dwelling – appearing functionally detached. Whilst I acknowledge the intended use as a garden room and detached garage, I find that the footprint and physical separation means that the proposal visually presents as a physically separate, unrelated, building which would not realistically be read as a subordinate addition to the host dwelling.

6. At the time of my site visit I found that the proposed location for the building would be generally limited in views within the public domain. I acknowledge that it would be visible from residential dwellings in the vicinity and in some views along Lodge Lane and Manchester Road, but in the context of the street scene and general appearance of the area these would be limited. I find that the proposal would be limited in terms of its impact to the general appearance of the area, but it should be kept in mind that character and appearance are separate matters. I have no evidence before me to support that an outbuilding of the proposed size would be consistent with the general characteristics of the immediate locality. I find that the proposal would detract from the general character of the area which appears to be characterised by dwellings with ancillary, subordinate outbuildings of smaller scale.
7. I acknowledge that the appeal site benefits from a large plot, and whilst it is stated by the appellant that the Council's refusal does not acknowledge that other properties in the locality have detached outbuildings of a similar or larger scale, this has not been evidenced within the appeal or submissions that are before me to enable me to attribute weight to this statement. Whether or not the site is capable of supporting a significantly larger development, such as a bungalow under back land development, is not within the scope of this appeal and any proposals of that nature should be considered on their own merits with an appropriate application. I have considered the proposal that is before me based upon the intended use.
8. I note the appellant sets out a willingness to work proactively in achieving a solution acceptable to all parties, however, no size reduction was made as a result of the amendments, albeit the use of the building is noted to have been amended. Regardless of the amendment to the intended use of the proposal, I do not find that the positioning of the proposal at the rear of a long garden is sufficient in reducing any perceived dominance, due to the separation from the host dwelling and the notable footprint as outlined above.
9. It is acknowledged that the proposal may be acceptable in other regards such as neighbouring residential amenity and highways, however, this does not overcome the issues I have identified with the unacceptable impact to the character of the surrounding area and wider setting, nor does it outweigh that the proposal would be of an inappropriate footprint in comparison to the host dwelling, and fails to present as a subordinate addition as a residential outbuilding. The proposed outbuilding, by virtue of its scale and layout, would not be in keeping with the character of surrounding properties and the wider setting, and would fail to be subordinate to the original dwelling due to the extensive footprint and lack of relationship with the host dwelling in question.
10. The proposal would be contrary to Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan Part 1 Policy ENV6, which requires that development should respect local character, and Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (Part 2) (LP2) Policy DM3, which expects development to achieve a high standard of design that respects the character of the local area, and be designed to respect the scale, character and appearance of any existing building within the site, and contribute positively to the character of the area. LP2 Policy DM3 also requires proposals to respect and, where appropriate, enhance the prevailing layout, scale and height, and be sympathetic to the characteristics of the development site. The proposal would also be contrary LP2 Policy DM21, which supports outbuildings/structures only if they meet the set criteria within that policy, which includes that the resulting development is in

keeping with the character and appearance of, and is subordinate to, the original dwelling and surrounding properties and the wider setting.

11. The proposal would also be contrary to the guidance set out within the Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings 2021, which is clear that proposals for new domestic outbuildings must be proportionate to the original dwelling, and that outbuildings should be close to the house and generally be in keeping with the character and appearance of the original dwelling.

Other Matters

12. I note that there has been a representation received from a neighbouring property in response to the proposal. I have dealt with matters relating to scale, character and appearance within the main context of this decision letter, and note that the Council have not raised a refusal reason based on residential amenity. Based upon the fact that the proposal would consist of a flat roof that would be approximately 3.3 metres in height, whilst I acknowledge the proximity to the boundary of 2 Lodge Lane, I do not find that the proposal would result in a significant impact upon neighbouring properties which would be sufficient to warrant refusal in this case.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Marshall

INSPECTOR