
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by **K Mee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/25/3371691

Sunnyside, 33 Dunnocksfold Road, Alsager, Cheshire East ST7 2TL

- 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 Ben Springett against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/2551/HOUS.
 - The development proposed is described as “retention of front wall incorporating alterations to respond to the refusal of planning application 23/4459C”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit a solid rendered wall had already been constructed. However, ‘retention’ as referred to in the application form and decision notice does not constitute an act of development. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on the basis that planning permission is sought for the development in accordance with the drawings submitted.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is situated on the corner of Dunnocksfold Road and a private road also named Sunnyside within an established residential area. Front boundary treatments within the surrounding area comprise hedges of varying heights with some low timber fences and low brick walls. These features contribute to the area’s locally distinctive verdant character.
5. A solid, white-rendered wall has been erected on the front and side boundaries of the appeal property facing Dunnocksfold Road and the adjacent private road. The appeal proposal involves alterations to the wall to reduce its height and create gaps which would be infilled with aluminium panels. Solid pillars between the panelled sections and solid, high aluminium vehicular and pedestrian gates would remain.
6. Despite the proposed alterations to the wall in its present form, given the prominent location of the property within the street scene and the proposed materials, the wall, infill panels and gates would be particularly alien in the street scene. It would therefore remain as a dominant and incongruous form of enclosure to the frontage

which would not reflect the height, form, details or materials of typical front boundary treatments within the locality.

7. The appellant has suggested that the render colour could be altered to an alternative colour. However, I am not persuaded that this would overcome the harm that its solid appearance has on the character and appearance of the locality.
8. I therefore find that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Accordingly, the development would conflict with Policies SE1 and SD2 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030 (July 2017) which, amongst other things, expects new development to contribute positively to an area's character and identity, reinforcing local distinctiveness including with regard to height and choice of materials. It would also conflict with Policy GEN1 of the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (December 2022) and Policy H6 of the Alsager Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2030 which seek to create high quality places and good quality design that responds to and integrates with local surroundings and the built environment.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has stated that the proposed means of enclosure across the frontage is necessary to achieve privacy and security. However, there is no substantive evidence before me to suggest that the proposed development represents the only proportionate means to address these matters.
10. I also acknowledge that the appeal property is not located within a conservation area, there are no highway safety concerns surrounding the proposal and there is sufficient space within the appellants property for vehicles to turn and exit in a forward direction. These are neutral matters which do not weigh in favour of allowing the appeal.
11. The relocation of the boundary wall relative to the highway may improve visibility for highway users and landscaping may be supplemented elsewhere within the appeal property which may, in time, soften the appearance of part of the wall. However, I have not been provided with any details of what the landscaping may entail and therefore, cannot be certain that it would mitigate the harm that I have identified. The stated improvement to highway visibility would not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
12. The appellant has drawn my attention to another high boundary treatment in the locality. However, I do not know how this came into being and its existence does not justify further harm. Furthermore, this example is not entirely comparable to the appeal site as it differs with regards to the design, materials and context. Consequently, I find that this does not justify the harm I have outlined above.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

K Mee

INSPECTOR