



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2025

by **J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/D/25/3374636

14 Greystones, Great Sutton, Ellesmere Port, CH66 3PD

- 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 Jenny Roberts against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02066/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a two-storey side extension at 14 Greystones, Great Sutton, Ellesmere Port, CH66 3PD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/02066/FUL, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 14GREYS/A/1, 14GREYS /A/2, 14GREYS /A/3, 14GREYS/A/4, 14GREYS /A/5
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building

Procedural Matter

2. The Council's decision letter makes reference to the proposed development as having a 'detrimental impact upon the amenities of the occupier of the room with no outlook'. There would not appear to be such a room and there is no mention of this in the Officer's Report or anywhere else in the documentation. I have, therefore, not taken this matter into consideration.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area around Greystones.

Reasons

4. No 14 is a detached, two-storey house, the northernmost of three, similarly designed houses situated at the end of the cul-de-sac that is Greystones The garage at No 14 has a hipped roof and is set some 3.5 to 4 metres away from the side boundary of the property with the rear of Nos 7-13 The Beeches to the north. The proposed extension would be constructed above the rear part of the garage,

which would be extended by around 1 metre at the back. It would have a hipped roof and would be set down some 0.8 metres below main roof ridge height, set back 1 metre from the main front elevation of the house, and would have a width of 3.5 metres and depth of 4.5 metres.

5. Policy ENV6 of the Council's Local Plan (Part One) Strategic Policies (LP1) indicates that the LP will promote sustainable, high quality design and construction, and that development should, where appropriate, respect local character.
6. Policy DM3 of the Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies (LP2) states that design solutions will be supported where, amongst other things, they are designed to respect the scale, character and appearance of any existing building on the site; contribute positively to the character of the area; and are sympathetic to the characteristics of the site. Policy DM21 of the LP2 states that extensions and alterations to dwellings, will be supported if the development is in keeping with the character and appearance of, and is subordinate to, the original dwelling and surrounding properties, and the wider setting.
7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings (SPD) indicates that side extensions of similar height to the existing dwelling will be supported where they are subordinate to the main building, and do not exceed 50 per cent of the width of the original house, taking into account the potential for such extensions to disrupt the symmetry of a dwelling or group of dwellings. To maintain a subordinate appearance, first floor extensions will should meet the following conditions: the front elevation of the first floor is set back at least 1 metre from the main front elevation of the house; the side elevation at first-floor level is set at least 1 metre from the side boundary; and the roof is lower than, in keeping with, and properly integrated into, the main roof of the dwelling.
8. The Council contends that the proposal, by virtue of its scale, design, materials, positioning and massing, would result in development that would not be subordinate to the original dwelling nor would it be in keeping with the character and appearance of the original dwelling the surrounding properties, or the wider setting, and would be visually harmful.
9. In this case, the proposed extension would meet the requirements for set-down and set-back, and the roof would be lower than, in keeping with, and integrated into the main roof of the dwelling. The width of the extension would appear to be around 60 per cent of the width of the original house. However, a significant proportion of the front elevation of the extension would effectively be hidden behind the existing hipped roof of the garage, thus reducing its apparent size in visual terms, and its limited overall scale would ensure that it was subordinate to the main house. Since the proposed extension would be to the open side of an end property, with a wide side garden separating it from the nearest houses to the north, it would not have any overbearing or asymmetrical impacts on the immediate vicinity.
10. Although the appeal property can be seen, in part, from much of the length of the road, the trees/bushes that run along the northern side of the road in the vicinity of the property effectively soften views of the side of the house that would include the extension, and would partly screen it. This would also reduce any visual impact that it might have on the street scene. Finally, I note that No 10 Greystones, also at the end of the cul-de-sac, already has a much larger side extension, such that the smaller and more subordinate proposal at No 14 would not appear out of character.

11. In conclusion, I find that the proposed extension would appear as subordinate to the main house and would integrate with it in terms of materials used and roof design. It would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area along Greystones. On that basis, it would not conflict with Policy ENV6 of the LP1 or Policies DM3 and DM21 of the LP2, nor with guidance on design of house extensions in the SPD. Accordingly, I allow the appeal subject to the conditions set out above.

Conditions

12. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR