



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 April 2025

by **J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/25/3359920

37 Primrose Close, Huntington, Chester, CH3 6DR

- 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 Michael Holgate against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01389/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a first-floor front extension above porch/garage, first-floor side extension above the garage, and single-story rear extension with rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Procedural Matter

2. It would appear that the proposal has gone through various revisions during consideration by the Local Planning Authority. The original application apparently proposed a first-floor front extension, first floor side extension above the garage and a single-storey rear extension with rooflights. Amended plans were then received which showed the removal of the front extension and a reduction in the scale of the first-floor side extension. Further amended plans were then received to revert back to the original scheme with some small adjustments including a reduced roof ridge height. The application was determined on the basis of the further amended plans.
3. However, all of the plans showing the proposed schemes share the same Drawing Number (PO1), the same date (22/08/2022) and the same revision (PO1.01). In addition, the amended plans utilised by the Council in determining the application (referred to by the Council as Proposed Plan and Elevations 2) appear to include a number of internal inconsistencies. These include windows that do not match between plans and elevations; a roof plan that does not show set-down/set-back of the side extension roof or the extent of the forward projecting roof; and a side elevation that does not show the side extension roof set-down. I have used primarily the proposed front elevation drawing to ascertain the effect of the further amended proposal on the street scene and its impact on the host property.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the area along Primrose Close.

Reasons

5. No 37 is a detached house situated close to the head of the cul de sac that is Primrose Close. It is a two-storey house with a single-storey front projection that includes porch and garage elements. The garage and a rear kitchen/dining area form a single-storey side extension, and there is a rear conservatory. The proposed development would involve some demolition and the construction of a new first-floor above the existing front projection and side extension, along with a new single-storey extension across the rear of the existing house.
6. Policy DM3 of the Council's Local Plan (Part 2) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies (LADP) indicates that development will be expected to achieve a high standard of design that respects the character and protects the visual amenity of the local area. Design solutions should respect the scale, character and appearance of any existing building within the site and contribute positively to the character of the area. Policy DM21 of the LADP indicates that extensions and alterations to dwellings should be in keeping with the character and appearance of, and is subordinate to, the original dwelling and surrounding properties, and the wider setting.
7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings (SPD) indicates that side extensions of similar height to the existing dwelling will be supported where they are subordinate to the main building. To maintain a subordinate appearance, the front elevation of the first floor should be set back at least 1 metre from the main part of the front wall of the house; the side elevation at first floor level is set at least 1 metre from the side boundary; and the roof is lower than, in keeping with, and properly integrated into, the main roof of the dwelling. In designing front extensions, the character of the existing building and surrounding buildings should be taken into account, while two-storey front extensions are unlikely to reflect the character and appearance of the existing building and are therefore unlikely to be supported. Finally, side extensions should remain separate and should not create a wrap-around extension projecting in front of the main original front wall of the house.
8. In this case, there are a small number of houses along Primrose Close which have projecting front extensions, including the neighbouring No 39. I have limited information on these examples although it would appear that none include two-storey side extensions in full wrap-around fashion. The appellant contends that the proposal would result in symmetry between the two dwellings at Nos 37 and 39, as there had once been when both had single-storey front extensions. However, the extension at No 39, while substantial, does not have a side extension at all, and there is, therefore, no wrap-around and much less in the way of bulk to add to the original house. In spite of this, I do still consider that the extension at No 39 forms a somewhat incongruous and over-dominant addition to the front of the house, and that it is not a development that should be readily replicated in the vicinity.
9. I acknowledge that the proposed side extension would retain a 1 metre gap between the dwelling and the side boundary, and that it would be a little less than 50% of the width of the main house. However, when the side extension is coupled with the larger front extension and the full-width rear extension, the whole set of extensions would represent a substantial addition to the house. Furthermore, although the roof ridge of the side extension would be 0.15 metres lower than the main roof ridge, I do not consider that this would result in an appearance of

sufficient subordination to the main roof. In addition, the wrap-around nature of the two-storey extension would mean that the side extension would not be set back from the main front elevation. The combination of the scale of the overall extensions, along with the dominant appearance of the front and side extensions in relation to the original house, would mean that the proposal as a whole would not be subordinate to the main dwelling,

10. In conclusion, I find that the proposal would not respect the character or appearance of the area along Primrose Close, nor would it protect the visual amenity of the area. The extensions would appear as an over-dominant feature of the dwelling and would not be subordinate. There are very few other examples of front extensions along the road, and this feature is therefore not characteristic of the surrounding area. Moreover, these examples are, in any case, not similar in scale or nature to the proposal at No 37. On this basis, I conclude that the scheme would conflict with Policies DM3 and DM21 of the LADP and guidance on house extensions in the SPD. Accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR