



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2025

by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/25/3365821

4 Pinehurst, Prestbury, Macclesfield, Cheshire SK10 4BA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
- The appeal is made by Mr Scott McQuade against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
- The application Ref is 25/0351/PRIOR-1AA.
- The development proposed is for an additional storey raising the maximum height of the roof by 2.6 metres.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is granted under the provisions Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for an additional storey raising the maximum height of the roof by 2.6 metres at 4 Pinehurst, Prestbury, Macclesfield, Cheshire SK10 4BA in accordance with the application Ref 25/0351/PRIOR-1AA.

Preliminary Matters

2. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of additional storeys subject to limitations and conditions.
3. There is no dispute between the parties that the proposal would comply with the limitations in paragraph AA.1. and the conditions in paragraph AA.2.(2) of Class AA. There is also no dispute regarding the prior approval matters in paragraph AA.2.(3)(a)(i), (iii) or (iv). From the evidence before me I see no reason to disagree. The only area of dispute relates to paragraph AA.2.(3)(a)(ii), that requires the local planning authority to assess the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, including the design and architectural features of the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, and any side elevation of the dwellinghouse that fronts a highway, considering any representations received.

Main Issue

4. This is the effect of the proposal on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

Reasons

5. Located on a cul-de-sac in a residential estate, the property is a 'L' shaped detached bungalow with a hipped roof set in a large plot. In the immediate

surrounding streets, there is a mixture of single and 2 storey dwellings, some set on split levels due to the sloping topography. Some bungalows are located adjacent to 2 storey dwellings, many dwellings are of individual designs, and plot sizes vary. The area has an open, verdant character, with mature and established landscaping. This creates a variable residential character.

6. Adjacent neighbouring properties are both bungalows, although due to the topography of the street sloping up, 2 Pinehurst is located at a higher land level than the appeal property. Likewise, 9 Castlegate, located on the corner of Pinehurst and Castlegate, is located at a lower level. Opposite No 4 is another bungalow, yet opposite No 2 is a 2 storey dwelling.
7. The proposal to erect an additional storey would considerably increase the height of the dwelling. However, the offset distance from No 9, and the alteration of the gable end to a hipped roof over the single storey garage would result in there being an appropriate height transition, rising commensurately with the land level. The height at its maximum point, as is clear on the plan, would be the marginally lower than the height of No 2, which also enables the extension to be read as a stepping up in heights, forming a congruous addition. This would positively respond to the surrounding dwelling heights and topography.
8. Given the varying house types and heights, and combinations of 2 storey houses adjacent bungalows, some closer than these dwellings would be, increased visibility would not be harmful, and the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse. Materials would be suitable and the architectural features would be acceptable.
9. Whilst neighbouring properties report of harm to their living conditions, the change from the gable to the hipped roof over the garage, and the intervening distances between dwellings, means that there would not be a significant adverse effect on No 9. Additionally, a shortage of bungalows in the area is not a reason to withhold prior approval.
10. Consequently, the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse. It would therefore accord with the design policies contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

11. The development permitted by this appeal is subject to the conditions set out in Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA, paragraph AA.2.(2) of the GPDO. Building in accordance with the approved details is specified as a procedural requirement in paragraph AA.3.(14) of Class AA.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and prior approval is granted.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR