

STRATEGIC PLANNING BOARD

APPEAL SUMMARIES

Application No: 09/0088p

Appellant: Mr Richard Fielding

Site Address: Hawthorns, Brookledge Lane, Adlington

Proposal: First floor extension, alterations to the roof & single storey rear extension

Level of decision: Delegated

Recommendation: Refuse approval

Decision: Refused 31/3/2009

Appeal Decision: Dismissed 21/8/2009

MAIN ISSUES

The application site is located within an isolated location of the Green Belt, therefore extensions to the dwelling should be limited to 30% as stated within GC12. The dwelling in question has been substantially extended previously, amounting to 181% to date. The proposal would have increased this amount to 237%.

Permitted Development rights were put forward as very special circumstances in order to justify the development. The Council gave this issue consideration, however little weight in terms of overcoming harm to the visual amenity & openness of the Green Belt.

INSPECTOR'S REASONS

The Inspector considered that the proposal would result in the a further increase in floorspace and bulk to the dwelling that would be contrary to GC12 within the Local Plan and Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts.

The very special circumstances put forward by the applicant / agent were noted, however the Inspector did not give the possibility to extend by utilising permitted development rights any significant weight.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE COUNCIL

The Inspector's decision agrees within Local Plan policy GC12 & offers some guidance regarding what does constitute a very special circumstance.

Application Number: P09/0139

Appellant: Mr David Mitchell

Site Address: 197 Underwood Lane, Crewe, Cheshire, CW1 3SE

Proposal: Proposed Side Extension to Form a Two Bedroom Flat

Level of Decision: Delegated

Recommendation: Refuse

Decision: Refused 15/04/2009

Appeal Decision: Dismissed 20/08/2009

MAIN ISSUES

The Inspector states that the main issues in the appeal were the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the local streetscene and on highway safety.

INSPECTOR'S REASONS

No.197 Underwood Lane is an end terrace house, in the Crewe settlement area. At the front, the houses in the terrace, have a ground floor bay window and front door with two, one wide and one narrow, windows above. Some of the houses have a canopy type roof extending over the bay and front door whilst others have a flat roof to the bay.

The Inspector states that the two storey side extension would have a small bay window with hipped roof and a first floor window with a lower lintel than others in the row. The Inspector notes that the Extensions and Householder Development SPD explains that windows on extensions should normally be the same scale as on the main property because the size, proportions, heights, style and ratio of solid wall to openings all play an important part in defining the character and architectural style of a house. The Inspector also notes that the SPD requires that roof forms should reflect those on the existing dwelling.

The Inspector states that the design of the extension would not follow these principles. The size and proportions of the windows and the hipped roof to the bay would be incongruous elements in the context of the row. The extension would not reasonably respect the form and rhythm of the terrace and would thereby detract from the character and appearance of the local street scene along Underwood Lane. Therefore this would be contrary to Policy BE.2 of the Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011.

The Inspector notes, that in 2008 planning permission was granted to convert the existing house into two flats, and that provision for parking of residents' cars was not required. However, the appeal proposal would mean that there could potentially be three households on the site, and without the provision of off-street parking the proposal would create a threat to highway safety and is therefore contrary to Local Plan policies BE.3 and TRAN.9.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE COUNCIL

This is a good decision for the Council as the Inspector gave substantial weight to the Local Development Framework "Extensions and Householder Development" Supplementary Planning Document when considering the design of windows and roof forms of proposed development in relation to neighbouring development. The Inspector also highlighted that an intensification of residential units in the absence of off street parking at this property which is sited along a local distributor road could lead to on street parking and an impact on highway safety. The proposed development was deemed to contrary to Policies BE.2 (Design Standards) and the SPD in respect of the design of the development, and Policies BE.3 (Access and Parking) and TRAN.9 (Car Parking Standards) in relation to the lack of off street parking. The decision will reinforce the importance of good design which respects surrounding development when considering future proposals.