



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2025

by M Clowes BA (Hons) MCD PG CERT (Arch Con) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/25/3370806

Holly Farm, Tushingham, Whitchurch SY13 4QS

- 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 and Mrs Williams against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01066/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'porch'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form as there is no evidence before me, that the appellant agreed to the altered description contained on the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in relation to this appeal is the effect of the proposed development upon the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a detached 2-storey dwelling of a traditional linear planform, with a high wall to window ratio and dual pitched roof with side facing gables. Typical of rural architecture it contributes positively to the rural environs in which it is located.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings (SPD) 2021, provides specific guidance on the types of residential development that are likely to be supported by Policies DM 3 and DM 21 of the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (Part 2); Land Allocations and Detailed Policies (LP Part 2) 2019. The SPD advises that factors to be taken into account include amongst other things, the degree of prominence; how varied the character of the area is; the size and arrangement of windows and doors and the shape of the roof. Materials, windows, doors and the angle of pitch of sloping roofs will normally be expected to match the existing building. With specific regard to front extensions, the SPD advises that they should project up to 1.5m from the original front wall of the dwelling.
6. The proposed porch extension would project 3.5m from the front elevation of the dwelling, significantly beyond the SPD maximum guideline. Although subordinate in scale to the host dwelling, the almost square footprint would result in a large,

boxy bulk and mass, atypical of traditional porch proportions. This would be exacerbated by the shallow hipped roof formation and the high window to wall ratio arising from the extensive glazing. The specific proportions and forward projection of the proposed extension would therefore fail to reflect the architectural character of the host dwelling as described above, resulting in an unsympathetic and incongruous addition.

7. The extension would be set back from the road behind the car parking area, and the adjacent 2-storey barn and roadside fencing would offer a degree of screening from public views. Notwithstanding the specific viewpoints presented by the appellant, I observed that the extension would be visible directly to the front, and the anomalous roof form would be noticeable above the fence in views along the road from the north, particularly when planting is not in leaf.
8. Although nearby dwellings vary in age and architectural style, where porches exist, they comprise traditional forms with a small footprint and dual pitched roofs with front facing gables, such that the inconsistent appearance of the proposal would be harmfully conspicuous. Even if I could accept that the proposed extension would not be prominent, it would not justify development that does not contribute positively to the area. Taking all of this together the proposal would fail to comply with the SPD guidance.
9. I find that the proposal would adversely affect the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the area. Hence, it would conflict with Policy ENV6 of the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (Part 1); Strategic Policies 2015, which seeks amongst other things that new development respects local character. Conflict is also found with Policies DM 3 and DM 21 of the LP Part 2, which require that extensions have a high standard of design in keeping with the character and appearance of the dwelling, surrounding properties and the wider setting.

Other Matters

10. An agricultural worker's dwelling (AWD) has been sited on adjacent land perpendicular to the host dwelling, with a close boarded fence in between. It is unclear how the proposal would improve the appellant's privacy given that there is no direct overlooking between the ground floor windows in the front elevation of each dwelling. Whilst acknowledging there may be a perception of overlooking, the evidence indicates that the AWD is a temporary structure. However, the harm arising from the proposal would be permanent, enduring for the lifetime of the development. This matter attracts limited weight.
11. I acknowledge that the scheme was amended during the application process. However, that does not automatically render the proposal acceptable and I have identified harm as explained above.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, having regard to the development plan and all other considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

M Clowes – INSPECTOR