
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025

by **E Heron MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/W/25/3365560

14 Breezehill Road, Neston, CH64 9TL

- 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 Lloyd against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03154/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of rear single storey extension, porch canopy, side single storey extension (with rooms within the roof) rooflights and dormer loft extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit I saw that a gable end roof, rear dormer and rear extension were under construction. I have however, dealt with the appeal on the basis of the plans before me.
3. As part of the appeal process the appellant provided a revised drawing with a marginal lowering of the height of the proposed rear dormer, and it is requested that I determine the appeal on this basis. Although this plan has not been subject to public consultation the development proposal is not substantively changed, and I do not consider that taking account of it would lead to procedural unfairness. I have therefore based my decision on this amended plan.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The site is within a residential area of bungalows. In the vicinity of the appeal site, the prevailing house types are semi-detached pairs, some with gable-ends and others with hipped roofs, but generally the pairings are symmetrical. There is an overall cohesion and uniformity in the scale and massing of dwellings, and their set back from the road. There is also a particular spaciousness around corner plots in the vicinity of splayed road junctions. In the context of the appeal site, this sense of spaciousness is of particular note when viewed from Breezehill Close.
6. The existing bungalow is simply proportioned, and its scale is sympathetic with its semi-detached pair and other bungalows within the site's context. It is set back from both Breezehill Road, and Breezehill Close, and its position and hipped roof

contribute to spaciousness. Due to its corner location, the front, side and rear elevations are prominent, but sit comfortably within the street scene.

7. The proposed extension would extend the built form closer to the side boundary, harmfully eroding the spaciousness experienced from Breezehill Close. This would be exacerbated by the height and bulk of the gable end form. The ridge and eaves height would be a continuation of the roof of the existing such that the bungalow would appear longer, and the existing modest side projection would become centralised. Whilst simple in design and retaining existing features, this would not be sympathetic with the scale and proportions of the semi-detached neighbour, and other generally symmetrical pairings within the site's context. It would therefore appear as a harmfully discordant feature within the street scene.
8. Whilst the proposed dormer would be set in from the side elevation, it would not be set down from the ridge or set up from the eaves, and it would dominate the rear roof space of the host dwelling. Due to its prominence within the street scene it would be discordant with the general scale and massing of surrounding development. It is acknowledged that its external materials could be conditioned, however this alone would not overcome the proposed dormer's harmful visual impact.
9. Taking all elements together, the proposal fails to comply with the guidance in the Cheshire West & Chester Council Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings (SPD). This sets out design parameters, including for corner plot dwellings and roof alterations, to ensure that development make a positive contribution to the street scene. It also fails to comply with Neston Neighbourhood Plan policies NNDS1 and NND1, that require development to respond positively to local context.
10. I have taken account of the other examples of extensions provided by the appellant. 45 and 48 Breezehill Road are within a different context of detached gable ended bungalows. The extension elements are modest in length relative to the host dwellings even with a matching roofline and space to the sides is retained. Furthermore, neither of these examples are related to prominent corner plots where the rear elevation is also visible, nor do they unbalance a semi-detached pairing. The example of 5 Breezehill Road refers to a lapsed planning permission that also pre-dates the SPD. For these reasons, I attribute minimal weight to these factors.
11. The appellant references permitted development rights; however, it has not been shown that a similar scale of development projecting towards the side boundary, in a corner plot location would be achievable under these allowances. In respect of the rear extension, the Council considers this to be acceptable in principle, and I see no reason to disagree.
12. For these reasons, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such it would conflict with Policy ENV6 of the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (Part One), Strategic Policies; and Policies DM3 and DM21 of the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (Part Two), Land Allocations and Detailed Policies. These policies seek to promote high quality design in keeping with the character of the area and subordinate to the original dwelling, amongst other things.

Other Matters

13. It is acknowledged that the proposed dormer would provide a larger area of useable internal accommodation, compared with one that would fully accord with the SPD parameters. However this would be a private benefit which does not attract sufficient weight to overcome the harm I have identified.
14. I note that no objections have been received from neighbours. However, the lack of objections does not equate to a lack of harm.

Conclusion

15. The proposal conflicts with the development plan, and there are no other considerations that outweigh that conflict. For the reasons outlined, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Heron

INSPECTOR