



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2025 by Sara Manson DipTP

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/25/3366327

Fields Cottage, Moss Lane, Tiverton, Cheshire CW6 9HN

- 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 & Mrs J Mrozic against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03737/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'removal of kitchen single slope roof, replacement with additional bedroom under a double pitch roof to match the existing roof line of the cottage'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for development described as 'removal of kitchen single slope roof, replacement with additional bedroom under a double pitch roof to match the existing roof line of the cottage' at Fields Cottage, Moss Lane, Tiverton, Cheshire CW6 9HN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/03737/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: As Proposed Fields Cottage Moss Lane Tiverton Heath – 9:8:23.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Appeal Procedure and Main Issue

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. The main issue in which is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey cottage with a multi-gabled pitched roof. Although the dwelling has undergone several extensions over time, the rendered façade and evenly spaced fenestration contribute to a visually coherent appearance that effectively conceals evidence of such. The property is modest in scale and sits within an extensive plot in a secluded and semi isolated rural location.
4. The proposed extension seeks to enhance the internal functionality of the existing four-bedroom dwelling by providing a second bathroom. This addition aligns with

common residential standards, as a second bathroom is typically expected in homes of this size. Notably, the development would not increase the number of bedrooms and would therefore maintain the existing housing typology. It would sit above an existing single-storey side extension and would not extend toward the site boundary. Despite not being set down from the rear gable roofline, its generous setback from the principal elevation and front gable would ensure it remained visually subordinate.

5. The design incorporates architectural features consistent with the dwelling's character, including a gable dormer window and a matching roof pitch. Its modest scale and massing, in the context of a large plot with no immediate neighbours, would ensure it does not appear unduly prominent. While it may be partially visible from the adjacent public right of way (Tiverton FP16), the extensive boundary landscaping would help to screen the development and reduce its visual impact from public vantage points.
6. For these reasons, the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would comply with Policies ENV 6 and SOC 3 of the Cheshire West and Chester Council Local Plan (Part One) Strategic Policies (2015), Policy DM 21 of the Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies (2019), along with guidance contained in the House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings Supplementary Planning Document (2021) and in the Beeston, Tiverton and Tilstone Fearnall Neighbourhood Development Plan (2017). These policies, amongst other things, require development to respect the character and appearance of the original dwelling and remain subordinate to it.

Other Matter

7. The explanation to Policy DM 21 refers to restricting the size of extensions and alterations to dwellings, suggesting that they should not increase the size of the original dwelling by more than 30%. Given previous additions to the appeal building, it seems sufficiently clear that the appeal scheme would take the dwelling over this figure.
8. That said, this position is part of the explanatory text of the policy and not the policy itself. It is also introduced 'as a general guide' and not an expressed maximum. It is important therefore, in terms of the qualitative criteria set out by DM 21 itself, that a decision maker should satisfy themselves that any extension or alteration would give rise to harm even if this figure were to be breached. As I have explained above, this would not be the case. As such, there would be no conflict with DM 21.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have set out a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plan, as this provides certainty and precision. A condition requiring the use of materials matching that of the existing building is also necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The appeal scheme would comply with the development plan for the reasons I have set out and there is nothing to suggest a decision other than in accordance

therewith. I therefore recommend the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions specified.

Sara Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission granted, subject to the conditions set out.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR