



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2025

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/25/3374424

16 Selkirk Drive, Holmes Chapel, Cheshire, CW4 7LJ

- 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 Ben Bleasdale against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/2817/HOUS.
 - The development proposed is a garden boundary fence (retrospective) and a ground-floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the garden fence. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the ground floor side extension and planning permission is granted for a ground floor side extension at 16 Selkirk Drive, Holmes Chapel, Cheshire, CW4 7LJ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 25/2817/HOUS, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted (the ground-floor side extension) shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Bleasdale 01/25; and Bleasdale 02/25.
 - 3) Notwithstanding the detail specified in the planning application and on the plans, the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted (the ground-floor side extension) shall match those used on the existing property.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two-storey dwelling, which is situated in a prominent corner location within a modern residential estate. A common characteristic of the estate layout is relatively wide open grassed/landscaped areas to the side of dwellings on the corner plots. These are a relatively spacious and attractive feature of the area.
4. The proposal is for two distinctly separate forms of development. The appellant is seeking to retain a solid timber fence, which has been erected to the side and across part of the front of the property. It encloses much of the original open

grassed area. In addition, a ground-floor side flat-roofed extension is proposed. The extension would be used as a garden room/home office.

5. Policy SD2 of the adopted Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy states that all development will be expected to contribute positively to the area's character and identity. In addition, Policy SE1 states that the design of proposals should be of high quality and, wherever possible, enhance the built environment. These requirements are reflected in the detail of Policy GEN1 of the Council's Site Allocations and Development Policies Document and Policy CE5 of the Holmes Chapel Neighbourhood Plan. I consider the policies to be consistent with the provisions of paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (NPPF).
6. Although objections have been raised by third parties to the whole development, I note that the Council considers the ground-floor extension to be generally acceptable, although it expresses reservations regarding the use of timber cladding on the walls. I share the Council's opinion, insofar that the proposed extension would be a relatively small addition to the property and, subject to the use of external materials that would match the existing dwelling, it would not have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the streetscene.
7. Turning to the fence, I observed at my site visit that there are other examples of timber fencing along boundaries within the wider estate. However, in this case, the prominent position, height, length, and solid appearance of the fencing have created an overly dominant and imposing feature, notwithstanding the planting between the fence and the highway. I consider that it is at odds with its surroundings and is unacceptably harmful to the appearance of the streetscene. Consequently, it conflicts with the provisions of the Development Plan and with the NPPF, as referred to above.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard conditions relating to the time period in which to commence the development and the listing of the approved plans, a condition is also imposed requiring that the materials to be used in the construction of the extension match the existing dwelling. This is necessary to ensure a satisfactory external appearance.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be allowed in relation to the ground-floor side extension. Regarding the garden boundary fence, the appeal is dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR