
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2025 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/25/3367951

48 Hawthorn Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire East SK9 5DG

- 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. Christopher McLaughlin against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0226/HOUS.
 - The development is for a proposed two-storey rear extension and the addition of solar panels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

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.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

3. A revised description of development omitting narrative wording was agreed between the parties and I have used this above. This does not change any element of the appeal scheme and would not affect the ability of the main parties to make their cases in respect thereof. The main issue in which is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hawthorn Lane Conservation Area (HLCA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a traditional detached four storey property designed in the Domestic Revival style, with an added two storey side extension. Its rear elevation is less ornate than the façade. However, it includes an oversailing roof with dormer windows, brick quoins, and a string course below the first floor windows. These are characteristic of the architectural details present in the original dwelling's frontage and the wider HLCA. The site also benefits from a generous plot length, where the land levels descend towards the rear. Set within a residential area, it forms part of a row of individually designed substantial properties, which are unified through a cohesive architecture and material palette. This adds to the traditional consistency and originality of Hawthorn Lane, which contributes positively to the significance of the HLCA.
5. The proposed two storey rear extension would span across the entire width of the rear elevation. It would therefore lead to an excessively large and dominant addition disproportionate to the host dwelling, where its size would be further

emphasised by the site's reduction in land levels. Flat roofs are present in the area and the inclusion of a roof lantern would break up the expanse of it on the dwelling. However, the scale and breadth of the proposal's roof would accentuate its boxy and bulky form, resulting in an obtrusive roofline that would detract from the traditional qualities of the oversailing main roof. It would also conceal much of the brick quoin detailing. Whilst the string course would remain, its legibility would be unacceptably diminished by the proposal's height and massing directly beneath it. The appeal scheme would therefore unacceptably erode the few original architectural features present at the rear, thereby reducing the building's contribution to the significance of the HLCA.

6. Although the proposal would be at the rear, it would still be prominent from the adjacent public right of way. Additional partial views would also be available through the wide side gap at Hawthorn Lane. In any case, and even if the proposal were not obvious in the public realm, its design would remain inappropriate to both the character and appearance of the HLCA. The proposal would not extend beyond the rear building lines and the large plot size could accommodate it. The appellant also states it would not appear imposing in comparison to the existing four storey rear elevation. Nevertheless, this does not justify an extension of the size and design proposed for the reasons I have set out. The appellant has cited examples of nearby extensions which I saw on my site visit. However, these are not comparable to the appeal scheme as they are narrower in width and clearly subordinate to the main property.
7. For the above reasons, the proposal would harm the significance of the HLCA and would neither preserve, nor enhance its character or appearance. Given its localised effect, the harm would be less than substantial for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Even so, by virtue of the above, it would be at the upper end thereof and I am mindful that the conservation of the HLCA is a matter of considerable importance and weight. In such circumstances, the harm should be weighed against the proposal's public benefits.
8. The appellant states the appeal scheme would increase their living accommodation space available and offers an additional recreational activity through a private swimming pool. The extension would also have solar panels, be insulated to the highest standard and its rainwater would be collected to a reservoir tank. Ultimately, the appellant's stated benefits are mostly private. Whilst there would be some environmental benefits, in this instance, they carry only very limited weight that would be insufficient to outweigh the harm to the HLCA.
9. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policies SD 1, SD 2, SE 1 and SE 7 of the Cheshire East Local Plan 2017; Policies GEN 1, HER 3, and HOU 11 of the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document 2022; Policies H2 and TH3 of the Wilmslow Neighbourhood Plan; and the Framework. Together, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and to respect, conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets.

Other Matters

10. The Council's refusal of the application following the appellant engaging and meeting with their amendment requests are matters that should be taken up with them directly and are not for me to resolve here. Reference was made to other planning approvals. However, I have not been provided with details of these, and I

therefore cannot be sure that they represent a sufficient comparison to the appeal scheme such that I would change my findings.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Kim Vo

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR