



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2026 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/25/3375743

1 Malpas Drive, Great Sankey, Warrington WA5 1HN

- 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 and Mrs A Pickering against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/01035/FULH.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey rear extension with two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

3. The Council raised no concern regarding the proposed single storey rear extension, and I find no reason to disagree. My recommendation therefore focusses on the two storey side extension. The main issue in regard to which is its effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey semi-detached property, with an existing single storey side and rear extension, in a residential area. It occupies a prominent corner plot with a generous side gap, a front driveway and a large rear garden. A wide alleyway also runs along at the rear. As such, the openness around the appeal building results in a sense of spaciousness along Huntley Street, which contributes positively to the area's character and appearance.
5. The proposed first floor front window within the two storey side extension would not align vertically with the opening below. However, it would be centrally positioned within the side extension and match the height of the existing first floor front windows. The proposed extension would also be setback from the front and side at first floor and be finished in matching materials.
6. Nonetheless, it would fail to provide a one metre gap to the side at first floor and would exceed 50% of the width of the original house. As such, it would not accord with the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2021. Its close proximity to the side boundary, two storey scale and wide and bulky form would constitute a dominating and disproportionate addition to the original dwelling.

Although the ridge height would be below the main roofline, the reduction would only be marginal and would not create a truly subordinate appearance. It would also erode the sense of spaciousness currently experienced to the side of the property, resulting in an unduly prominent and obtrusive structure that would unacceptably diminish the open character along this part of Huntley Street.

7. Whilst the proposal would align with the side wall of Number 1 Huntley Street, the considerable distance between the two properties results in them not being read as part of the same building line. This end terrace also occupies a much smaller plot and was originally constructed along the edge of the footway. The appeal scheme would not be sufficiently comparable to the existing two storey side extensions on Malpas Drive, given that these are not located on corner plot properties and they generally retain an appropriate side gap. The rear garden could be accessed via alternative points, but this does not go on to justify the appeal scheme, given that the identified harm extends to matters other than access arrangements.
8. Therefore, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policy DC6 of the Warrington Local Plan 2023. Amongst other things, this policy seeks to ensure all development proposals are of good design.

Other Matters

9. There is no sufficiently conclusive evidence to demonstrate that the appellant's evolving household needs cannot be met through alternative measures, which might have a lesser impact than the appeal scheme. I remain to be convinced that the proposal is the only way to achieve the outcome the appellant desires. Any concerns over a lack of engagement from the Council should be taken up with them directly and is not for me to resolve here. The retention of sufficient parking spaces would also not override the identified harm, for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend the appeal is dismissed.

Kim Vo

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR