



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by K Mee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/25/3369018

129 Knutsford Road, Wilmslow, Cheshire SK9 6EL

- 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 Wheatley against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/1458/HOUS.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing single storey store to the rear replacing with single storey extension with roof lantern.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development differs from the application form to the decision notice. The above has been taken from the application form, which adequately describes the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at No 131 Knutsford Road, with regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling located in a predominantly residential area of similar properties within the settlement of Wilmslow. An existing small porch with mono-pitch glazed roof and partially glazed side wall is sited at the rear of the property alongside the common boundary wall with No 131. Beyond this lies a two-storey element with further single storey flat roof attached outhouse. Other properties in this terraced row appear to have been extended at the rear including the neighbouring property at No 131 which has a two-storey extension.
5. The proposed single storey extension would be set back by only a small distance from the common boundary but would project significantly from the main rear elevation wall of the neighbouring dwelling by approximately 6.4m. Given this depth, and as it would be sited very close to the common boundary, the proposal would result in a substantial block of development with an overall height of approximately 2.8m that would be a considerable margin above the height of the existing common boundary wall. It would also have a much greater impact than the existing partially glazed rear porch.

6. The neighbouring property has a rear facing window serving a habitable room next to the boundary, and a kitchen window facing the proposed extension. As such, because of the height and projection of the extension, the proposal would lead to an undue sense of enclosure for the neighbouring occupiers, unacceptably dominating outlook and adversely impacting light. This is despite the existence of the two-storey rear extension at No 131 and orientation of the proposal.
7. Consequently, I find that the proposal would cause significant harm to the living conditions of the residents of No 131. It would therefore be contrary to Policies HOU11 and HOU12 of the Cheshire East Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (December 2022) which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that new development does not cause unacceptable harm to amenity of nearby occupiers with particular regard to loss of light and the overbearing and dominating effect of new buildings.
8. The refusal reason also cites Policy SE1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030 (July 2017). This policy principally relates to design quality and only mentions residential living conditions in the context of privacy. On that basis, I find no conflict with it in relation to this main issue.

Other Matters

9. The appellant refers to a previously allowed appeal for a proposed two-storey rear extension at the appeal property. However, based on the limited information provided, it would appear the impacts from that proposed development would have been very different to this proposal given the separation from the boundary line. It is therefore not comparable to the appeal proposal and does not lead me to an alternative conclusion. Furthermore, given the date of the previous appeal decision, it would have been assessed against a different development plan context.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to another large extension at No 135. However, I do not know how this came into being and its existence does not justify further harm. Furthermore, this example is not directly comparable to the appeal proposal. Consequently, I find that this does not justify the harm I have outlined above.
11. I note that the proposal would not be visible from the street and so would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Also, no concerns are raised with regards to the scale, massing and materials in relation to the host dwelling. However, these are not factors which weigh in favour of allowing the appeal and do not diminish the harm I have identified above.
12. I acknowledge the appellant's concerns over the Council's assessment of the application. However, I have had regard solely to the planning merits of the proposal and this does not alter my findings.

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 should be dismissed.

K Mee

INSPECTOR