



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/25/3374679

2 Orchard Close, Winsford, CW7 1JW

- 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 Graham Clarke against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01242/FUL
 - The development proposed is to render part of the front facing elevation and gable side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rendering on the character and appearance of the area around Orchard Close and Pear Tree Close.

Reasons

3. No 2 is a detached brick-built bungalow situated on a corner plot at the junction of Orchard Close and Pear Tree Close. It is a wide-fronted dwelling with an open-timbered porch at the front, a large flat-roofed rear extension with pyramid rooflights, and an outbuilding by the rear boundary. There is a low hedge to the front boundary and a 1.7 metre high fence to the side and rear boundaries. The proposal would involve the rendering of the brickwork to the garage return walls, the front elevation from the central porch in each direction to the front corners of the building, and the side gable elevation from the front corner to the commencement of the rear extension. The proposed render would be of an African Ivory colour.
4. Policy ENV6 of the Council's Local Plan (Part One) Strategic Policies (LP1) indicates that development should, where appropriate, respect local character. 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 character and appearance of any existing building on the site, and contribute positively to the character of the area. Policy DM21 of the LP2 states that alterations to dwellings will be supported if the development is in keeping with the character and appearance of the original dwelling, surrounding properties, and the wider setting.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document: House Extensions and Domestic Outbuildings (SPD) similarly indicates that development will be supported where it is in keeping with the character and appearance of the original dwelling,

surrounding properties, and the wider setting. Factors taken into account will include the degree of prominence; how varied the character of the area is; design details; and whether matching materials will be used. It will normally be expected that materials will match the existing building.

6. The Council contends that the proposed render finish to the front and side elevation would be out of keeping with, and visually intrusive to, the character and appearance of the original dwelling, and the predominant character of development in the street and immediate surrounding area.
7. The bungalows on Orchard Close share a common design. They are all wide-fronted, brick-built dwellings with largely identical window patterns and linked garages between. The character and appearance of a common design is repeated on the adjacent Pear Tree Close, although the plots here are narrow and the dwellings have a gable-fronted design. Nevertheless, the prevailing character of the small estate that comprises these two roads is one of exclusively brick construction and uniformity in design.
8. The proposed rendering at the appeal property would result in the dwelling being significantly out of character with its surroundings in terms of materials used and overall appearance. The property is situated on a corner plot such that both the front and side elevations are readily visible in the street scene. The proposed render would be a prominent feature along the street frontage, and the render to the side elevation would be partially visible above the side boundary fence. The render would end at the rear of the original dwelling leaving the side wall of the rear extension with a brick façade. This would appear as an awkward transition that would add to the harm to the character and appearance of the estate as a whole.
9. The appellant notes the existence of rendered elements to dwellings along Swanlow Lane. I acknowledge this, but Swanlow Lane contains a wide variety of dwelling types, sizes and designs whereas Orchard Close and Pear Tree Lane together form a small estate of uniform design and materials throughout. I do not consider that Swanlow Lane represents a precedent for the use of render in the immediate surroundings of the appeal property.
10. The appellant also makes note of an appeal decision in Cuddington, around 5 miles away, where the use of render was allowed by the inspector. However, it would appear that the circumstances of the appeal property and its surroundings in this case were very different from those of the current proposal.

Conclusion

11. In conclusion, I find that the proposal would be an unsympathetic and inappropriate change to the appearance of the dwelling, harmful to the uniform character and appearance of Orchard Close and Pear Tree Close. On that basis, it would conflict with Policy ENV6 of the LP1, Policies DM3 and DM21 of the LP2, design guidance in the SPD, and with design criteria in paragraph 135(c) of the National Planning Policy Framework. Accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR