
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/25/3360333

396 London Road, Warrington, Cheshire WA4 5PW

- 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 Daniel Morley against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/01278/FULH.
 - The development proposed is a side and front extension to match footprint of the adjoining neighbour (398 London Rd) with half-hip roof, loft conversion and flat roof dormer at the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure and Main Issue

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal. The main issue in which is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey semi detached property with a hipped roof. It is very similar in this respect to others in the street which, along with the defined set back, spacing between the pairs, limited number of alterations and use of materials, lends a high quality consistency and pleasant originality to the street which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. In this context, the front gable would be an unacceptably anomalous feature on the most publicly prominent elevation of the building. The accompanying addition of the extended roof and half hip to the side elevation would emphasise the incongruity of the additions. The dormer window would subsume the rear roof slope in its entirety and make the rear of the building present as top heavy. Taken together, the alterations would detrimentally affect the original qualities the pair of buildings and, ultimately, the pleasantness of the street scene's consistency.
5. The proposals would therefore have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the area. As such it would fail to comply with Policy DC6 of the Warrington Local Plan 2023 and the guidance set out in the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2021 which both aim, amongst other things, for development to make a positive contribution to local character.

Other Matters

6. The use of matching materials would assist in integrating the extensions to a degree but not so much that their scale and design would be appropriate. I am also mindful of the land take of the extension being not dissimilar to that of the adjoined neighbour, but the use of a hipped roof in that case assists in its visual assimilation. Whilst existing vegetative cover close to the appeal side would provide some screening for the appeal scheme and the host building is set back from the road, this would not be sufficient to make the extensions acceptable which would retain more than marginal degree of visual effect in the public realm regardless.
7. Other changes that have taken place elsewhere are the exception rather than the norm and, in the main, they are subservient to and tend not to detract from the qualities of the area. They do not prevail sufficiently for me to change my findings. Any desire to add to the space within the building would benefit the incumbent occupiers privately. There are areas where the appeal scheme is acceptable, but these would be a lack of harm rather than a benefit. There would be some public realm and environmental improvements albeit they would be limited to a small scale. The Council's conduct during the life of the application does not relate to my consideration of the planning merits of the appeal and should be taken up with them directly.

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and, for the other reasons I have set out, material considerations to not attract sufficient weight to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR