



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2025

by **E Heron MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/25/3359799

**29 Berry Drive, Great Sutton, Ellesmere Port, Cheshire West and Chester
CH66 4LU**

- 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 Mrs Kourino against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02072/FUL.
 - The development proposed is for a two storey side and single storey rear extension
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Planning permission has previously been granted for the construction of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension, (Council Reference: 23/01600/FUL). I have noted the details of the approved scheme, and the elements that differ between this and the appeal proposal.
3. At the time of my site visit, a two-storey side extension had been constructed. This extension differed from the appeal proposal insofar as there was a small set back of the front wall at ground floor, as well as first floor, and different window types. For the avoidance of doubt, I have dealt with the appeal on the basis of the plans before me. I have therefore amended the heading to reflect this.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is in a residential area of two-storey, predominantly detached dwellings. There are informal groups of house types, with gable frontage houses featuring strongly, particularly in the context of the appeal site. There is an overall cohesive quality to the area due to the prevailing brick and tile facing materials, regular spacing of houses with a set back behind front gardens, and modest ground floor pitched-roof projections. Elements such as extensions and garages are generally subservient and not a distracting feature within the street scene.
6. The appeal property sits within a short row of similar dwellings. Their gable fronts, simple fenestration, and regular spacing has a rhythm that contributes positively to the street scene. Side extensions are set well back from the front elevations, and

other elements such as garages and porches are entirely subservient such that they do not disrupt the symmetry to the row of gable-fronts.

7. The Cheshire West & Chester Council Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings (SPD), provides guidance in respect of two storey side extensions. To maintain a subordinate appearance, it advises that the first floor should be set back by one metre from the main part of the front wall of the house and should be no more than 50% of the width of the original house, amongst other parameters.
8. The proposed plans show the two storey side extension to have a narrow set back at first floor. Whilst this would provide a visual break between the proposal and the gable front of the host dwelling, it would be barely discernible when viewed in the wider street scene. As a result, the front face of the extension would appear as a prominent continuation of the main dwelling. The width of the extension, (being over 50% of the width of the original house), cumulatively with the small set back, would amount to a dominant addition to the dwelling, lacking in subservience.
9. Furthermore, due to the minimal set back, the forward facing roof slope of the proposed extension would significantly disrupt the rhythm and symmetry of the prominent gable frontages within the row. The resulting appearance of the dwelling would be discordant with the character and appearance of the area and would not accord with the guidance contained within the SPD.
10. The proposed flat-roofed porch canopy would to a limited extent, break up the visual massing of the extension, but would not overcome the harm I have identified. I acknowledge that the appellant is willing to make refinements to the design of the proposal and has referred to a porch, or differing materials for the roof overhang. However, no details have been provided. I am unable therefore, to attribute weight to this proposed change.
11. In support of the appeal, my attention has been drawn to other properties in the area that have already been extended in a similar manner to that proposed. I saw that these are in the minority, and I do not know the circumstances of those cases or the policies that applied at the time of their consideration. In any case they relate to a different street scene context, and I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.
12. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed two storey side extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, the development conflicts with Policy DM21 of the Cheshire West & Chester Council Local Plan. This policy requires extensions and alterations to dwellings to be in keeping with the character and appearance of, and is subordinate to, the host dwelling and surrounding properties, amongst other things.

Other Matters

13. The Council does not consider that the proposed extension would give rise to overlooking or loss of privacy for neighbouring occupiers and I see no reason to disagree. I also acknowledge the appellant's circumstances in respect of the construction that has taken place by contractors, the cost of any additional work, and potential disturbance during any future construction work. However, these are not reasons in themselves, to allow the appeal, which should be judged on its

planning merits. They are matters that do not outweigh the harm I have identified in respect of the main issue.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Heron

INSPECTOR