



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by K Mee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/25/3372832

Woodville, 35 Northwich Road, Cranage, Cheshire CW4 8HL

- 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 Tamara Bennett against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0874/HOUS.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the open countryside and host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a detached dwelling situated in a row of similarly large dwellings of varying architectural styles, located in linear fashion along Northwich Road. The parties agree that the appeal site, within Rudheath Woods, is located within the open countryside, owing to the limited number of services in the area. The proposed development consists of a 2 storey rear extension.
4. Policy RUR11 of the Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (December 2022) (SADPD) seeks to restrict the size of extensions to buildings outside of settlement boundaries to ensure that they do not result in disproportionate additions over and above the original dwelling. A disproportionate addition is further defined as an increase in size to the original dwelling, usually determined by floorspace, of 50% or more. This is supported by Policy PG6 of the CELPS which also seeks to restrict disproportionate extensions to original dwellings within the open countryside.
5. Whilst the parties dispute the actual amount of the cumulative increase in floorspace, the evidence before me confirms that it would, in any event, exceed 50% being either 103% or 61%, indicating that the proposal comprises a disproportionate addition. I note that the increase in footprint may only be 28%, however this two-dimensional measure underestimates the scale, mass and thus impact of the proposal. As a result, floorspace is a more useful measure of the size of the extension in this appeal.
6. The appellant asserts that the former presence of various outbuildings within the rear garden, evidenced by historic maps, should be taken into consideration with

regards to disproportionate additions and the exception provided within criteria 3 (iv) of Policy RUR11 of the SADPD. However, this exception applies to proposals for small scale domestic outbuildings only and as such is not determinative.

7. Policy RUR11 (2) of the SADPD makes it clear, in determining whether an extension would be disproportionate, other aspects of an extension's design also need to be taken into account. Policy HOU11 of the SADPD further seeks to secure development which is subordinate to the existing dwelling. The proposal would extend the rear elevation of the main part of the house so that it would be level with the deep projection of the existing side extension. In doing so, it would significantly increase the mass of the house. Taken together with the extension's roof ridge being level with the roof ridge to the main part of the house, the proposed extension would consume the dwelling to the extent that the resulting building would bear little relation to the scale and form of the original dwelling. The resulting increase in scale and mass would be apparent in glimpsed views from the road between No 35 and No 37 and in private views from the rear.
8. Reference has been made by the appellant to properties in the locality which have been extensively extended or rebuilt larger. However, I do not have their details before me such that they are not afforded any material weight in my assessment.
9. I therefore find that the proposals comprise a disproportionate addition in this location which is harmful to the character and appearance of the open countryside and host dwelling, contrary to Policies RUR11, GEN1 and HOU11 of the SADPD and Policies PG6, SD1, SD2 and SE1 of the CELPS which seek, amongst other things, high quality development that is subordinate to the existing building, contributes positively to the built environment and area's character along with protecting and enhancing the natural and built environment.

Other Matters

10. I note the appellant's assertion that the proposal would result in a larger property with an enhanced level and standard of accommodation that better meets their needs. However, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to the Council's current 3.8 year housing land supply position for new housing within the plan area. However, this does not affect relevant policies relating to house extensions.
12. Whilst there are no concerns surrounding impacts on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, highway safety, flood risk and ecology, compliance with the development plan in these respects is a neutral factor.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan considered as a whole and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

K Mee

INSPECTOR