



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2025

**by R Major BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

### Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/25/3374224

#### **Tower Cottage, Quarry Road, Neston, Cheshire West and Chester CH64 7UA**

- 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 Swift against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
- The application Ref is 24/03766/FUL.
- The development proposed is erection of first floor extension over existing single storey projection, single-storey side extension to existing detached garage with new roof pitch, single-storey side extension to form glazed side entrance, alterations to windows and doors, new velux windows.

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of first floor extension over existing single storey projection, single-storey side extension to existing detached garage with new roof pitch, single-storey side extension to form glazed side entrance, alterations to windows and doors, new velux windows at Tower Cottage, Quarry Road, Neston Chester West and Chester CH64 7UA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/03766/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
  - 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
    - 24-041-PL.001(V1) – Location Plan
    - 24-041-PL.005(V3) – Proposed Floor Plans
    - 24-041-PL.006(V3) – Proposed Front and Rear Elevations
    - 24-041-PL.007(V3) – Proposed Side Elevations
  - 3) No development above ground level shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions and alterations hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The submitted appeal documents include a letter confirming that the description of the proposed development was amended during the determination of the planning application. I have used this amended description in the above banner heading and my formal decision.

3. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt. The Council does not assert that the appeal proposal would be inappropriate development within the Green Belt. On the evidence before me, and from what I observed on site, I see no reason to disagree.

### **Main Issue**

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property.

### **Reasons**

5. The appeal property is a large, two-storey, detached stone-built dwelling, within the green belt and open countryside. The wider surrounding area is verdant and rural in nature, characterised by open fields. However, the appeal site is located within a wooded area that includes a cluster of large dwellings of varying designs, occupying spacious plots. To the side and rear of the appeal dwelling is a detached, double garage finished in a mix of brick and stone.
6. The appeal proposal seeks to carry out extensions and alterations to the dwelling, as well as extending the existing detached garage and replacing its roof. It is also proposed that this extended outbuilding be connected to the appeal dwelling by a glazed side entrance extension.
7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings (2021) (SPD) states that new development will be supported where it is in keeping with the character and appearance of the original dwelling, surrounding properties, and the wider setting.
8. This SPD also states that extensions and outbuildings that are sufficiently subordinate to the main dwelling will be supported in order to ensure that they are in keeping with its character and appearance and that of the wider area, and the design, scale and dimensions of the original house will therefore determine the appropriate design, scale and dimensions of proposed development.
9. In this regard, I acknowledge that the proposed extension to the existing outbuilding would result in the total width of this structure being similar to that of the main dwellinghouse. However, as a result of its siting beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling, as well as its single-storey nature and finish using black timber effect cladding, I find that this structure would continue to appear as sufficiently subordinate to, and visually less prominent than, the two-storey stone-built dwellinghouse.
10. Additionally, given its significant set back from the highway and the height of the existing front boundary wall and entrance gates, views of this single-storey structure for passers-by, especially those in vehicles, would be restricted in comparison to views of the two-storey dwelling which sits closer to the highway.
11. Furthermore, the lightweight design and appearance of the flat roofed single-storey glazed link ensures that both these single-storey elements would be viewed as modern extensions to this traditional dwellinghouse. With the height of this glazed link ensuring that a visual gap would be retained between the roof of the single-storey element and the first floor of the dwellinghouse.
12. These factors all assist in reducing the visual prominence of the single-storey elements of the appeal proposal in comparison to the appeal dwelling.

13. I also observed on site that the substantially sized, nearby two-storey property at High Trees had connecting single-storey structures to the side. As such, the proposed single-storey element attached to the side of the two-storey appeal dwelling would not be an alien or uncharacteristic feature within this small cluster of dwellings.
14. Overall, I find that, in this particular case, the proposed extensions and alterations to the existing outbuilding, including the connecting glazed link, would ensure that it remains sufficiently subordinate to, and in keeping with, the character and appearance of the original dwelling, surrounding properties, and the wider setting.
15. I note the Council's Officer Report raised no concerns in respect of the design and appearance of the proposed first-floor extension over the existing single storey projection; the single-storey side extension to form a glazed side entrance and link; and the alterations to the windows and door. Additionally, the Officer Report raised no objection in respect of the proposed materials. From the information before me, and from what I observed on site, I see no reason to disagree with these assessments.
16. In view of all the above, I conclude that the proposed developments would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy ENV6 of the Cheshire West and Chester Council Local Plan (Part One) Strategic Policies (2015) and Policies DM3 and DM21 of the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies (2019). These policies together seek to ensure, amongst other things, that developments promote sustainable, high-quality design and construction; respect the character and protect the visual amenity of the local area; are designed to respect the scale, character and appearance of any existing buildings within the site; and be subordinate to the original dwelling and surrounding properties, and the wider setting.
17. I also find no conflict with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks to ensure that developments are visually attractive and are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment, as well as the guidance contained within the SPD.

### **Other Matters**

18. To the rear of the appeal site is a former water tower, now in residential use, which the Council state is a locally listed building. It is therefore a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). From the evidence before me this former water tower was built in 1884 by renowned architect Alfred Waterhouse and I found that the significance of this stone-built tower, in part, derives from its distinctive cylindrical shape and its height above the surrounding buildings within this largely rural landscape.
19. I observed on site that due to the considerable set back of the former water tower from the highway, in comparison to the appeal property, the proposed first-floor rear extension would not obstruct views of this NDHA, which in any case are already largely limited from this direction by existing mature vegetation.
20. Additionally, views of the lower sections of the former water tower from the road directly in front of the appeal site are currently obscured by a combination of mature vegetation and the front boundary wall at the appeal site, with only the higher sections of this former water tower being visible.

21. Accordingly, I find that the proposed single-storey extension to the existing detached garage building would not result in any further loss of views of this NDHA and the higher sections that are currently visible from Quarry Road would continue to be so. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would not cause any harm to the significance of this NDHA. Furthermore, I note that the Council's Conservation and Design Team raised no objection to the amended appeal proposal.

### **Conditions**

22. In addition to the standard time limit condition (1), I have attached a condition specifying the approved plans to provide certainty (2). Whilst not suggested by the Council I have also imposed a condition requiring full details of the external materials (3) to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions and alterations to be submitted. This condition is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the appeal property.

### **Conclusion**

23. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, the proposed development would accord with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate it should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore allowed.

*R Major*

INSPECTOR