



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2025 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/25/3369988

35 Oak Grove, Poynton, Cheshire East SK12 1AD

- 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. Lewis against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/5203/HOUS.
 - The development proposed is for part single / part double, front, side & rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part single / part double, front, side & rear extensions at 35 Oak Grove, Poynton, Cheshire East SK12 1AD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/5203/HOUS, 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 approved plans, drawing references: PL02 and PL04.
 - 3) The materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be as they are set out on the application form.

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. The Council do not object to the rear extensions, and I find no reason to disagree. My recommendation therefore focusses on the side elements and, specifically, their effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is a two storey semi-detached dwelling, featuring a red brick exterior and a red tiled pitched roof. It contrasts with the adjacent property at Number 33 Oak Grove (No. 33), which has white rendered elevations and a hipped roof. The surrounding area is characterised by a varied mix of traditionally designed semi-detached and detached dwellings and bungalows. These properties are set well back from the highway, resulting in a spacious suburban streetscape. Buildings

are interspersed with an irregular rhythm of gaps, where some have been narrowed due to side additions. This includes No. 33, which features a hipped roof, two storey rendered side extension up to the shared boundary.

5. The proposal would have a narrow width with a corresponding pitch roof set below the main ridgeline. It would have a recessed positioning at first floor, set well back from No. 33's side extension. Matching red brick and roof tiles would also be used. The proposal would therefore appear as a clearly subordinate and cohesive addition to the original dwelling. Given the different forms, materials and roof profile, it would also contrast distinctly from the more prominent side extension at No.33. When viewed together, the two extensions would appear as separate and distinguishable elements, thereby avoiding a terracing effect.
6. The proposal would fail to provide a one metre separation as outlined under Policy HOU 14 of the Poynton-with-Worth Neighbourhood Plan 2019 (PNP). However, a small gap sufficient for external side access would still be retained and would correlate with the irregular spacings along Oak Grove. Notwithstanding the absence of a side gap at No. 33, the proposal's side gap would still ensure a visual separation between the two dwellings.
7. For these reasons, the proposed side extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Whilst it would not fully comply with Policy HOU 14 of the PNP, but it would achieve its aim to prevent the creation of a terraced street and retain external side accesses. It would also not conflict with Policy HOU 11 of the PNP, Policy GEN 1 of the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document 2022, and Policy SE 1 of the Local Plan Strategy 2010 - 2030. Together, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure development proposals are of a high quality and make a positive contribution to their surroundings compatible with the existing character.

Other Matters

8. The levels of noise arising from the proposal would be similar to that of the main dwelling. Any noise and disruption occurring during the construction stage would be for a temporary period. Future concerns in these regards should be directed to the Council's Environmental Health function.

Conditions

9. To provide certainty and for enforcement purposes, it is necessary to impose the standard time limit and specify the approved plans. A condition is also necessary to ensure the materials accord with the details submitted in the application form, to maintain the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed given it would comply with the development plan and there is nothing compelling to suggest a decision other than in accordance therewith.

Kim Vo

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