



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2025

By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/25/3370155

185 Butterbach Road, Huntington, Chester CH3 6DE

- 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 S Gallagher against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00533/FUL.
 - The development proposed is Demolition of existing porch and attached garage, construction of front and side extensions, and forming a wider drive to accommodate 2 cars.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Demolition of existing porch and attached garage, construction of front and side extensions, and forming a wider drive to accommodate 2 cars at 185 Butterbach Road, Huntington, Chester CH3 6DE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00533/FUL and the plans submitted with it. subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby approved shall begin within three years of the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be completed entirely in accordance with the following approved plans: 4247/1 A(200)01 rev. A; 4247/1 A(300)01 rev. A; 4247/1 A(300)02 rev. A;
 - 3) Development above ground level shall not commence unless and until details of all external construction materials to be used in the development hereby approved, including windows, doors and rainwater goods, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall proceed in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 185 Butterbach Road (No.185) is a semi-detached house within a mid-late twentieth-century development of two-storey housing. No.185 and its already-extended dwelling pair, No.183, are located next to a sharp turn in the road, such that they are not seen in context with other terrace blocks or pairs. The street scene at this point is effectively single-sided, and the adjacent dwelling to No.185 on its

eastern boundary, No.174 Chester Road, is more bulky, differently oriented, and set at some distance.

4. Although the extensions would remodel the overall form of the housing pair by widening No.185, and the frontal addition of a small, but two-storey, gabled bay, this would not appear incongruous, as these dwellings are in a part of Butterbach Road (the Road) which is significantly more open, and set apart from the dominant development pattern of the remainder of the Road. No.183 is already extended with a two-storey wing which is not subordinate in its typical sense, it is only slightly set down and back from its principal frontage but built to a significant width¹, and accompanied by a small porch which conspicuously contrasts with the brick-based built forms around. That extension also addresses the turn in the Road with side-facing fenestration, which diminishes the importance of the front (main) elevation.
5. The sense of place provided by the existing dwelling pair and immediate neighbours is not consistent with the regular spacing, size, and symmetry of the remainder of the Road. Justification for subordination of an extension in pursuit of a consistency of a development pattern, such as that which might be typical of many suburban streets, may attract little weight where the setting or context of a subject building allows it to be considered independently of surrounding development. I consider that to be the case here, and that the development would not harm the visual amenity of the area.
6. The development would not appear cramped or obtrusive and would not impair the physical amenity of adjoining users. Consequently, and given the already altered state of the dwelling pair and its position in the street, I find that little planning harm would arise from the proposal. For that reason, any conflict with Policies DM21 and DM3 of the Cheshire West and Chester Borough Council Local Plan, which seek that extensions should be in keeping with existing character together with requiring a high standard of design, or any conflict with the guidance of the SPD, which is necessarily generic in nature, should attract little weight in the specific circumstances which I have here described.
7. Consequently, taking all matters raised into account, the appeal succeeds subject to the usual plans and timing conditions. The Council suggest a condition relating to the use of materials already identified on drawings, but this would lack precision², and I have attached another requiring details to be approved.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR

¹ Which does not appear to comply with the guidance referred to in the officer report at 6.0, being more than 50% of the original width.

² No materials appear on the approved drawings