

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 August 2017

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 07 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/17/3177657

2 Sibley Road, Heaton Moor, Stockport SK4 4HH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Anthony Clavin against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/065458, dated 13 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is proposed first floor extension including raising the eaves height and rear dormer, pitched roof over existing side extension.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The decision notice describes the development as proposed first floor extension including raising the eaves height and rear dormer, side extension, and new front porch (retrospective). This is a fuller description than on the application form and so I shall refer to this description accordingly.
2. No 26 Napier Road is the adjacent dwelling to No 2 Sibley Road but on the submitted location plan it is indicated as being No 62. This appears to be a typographical error.

Decision

3. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

4. I consider that the main issues are the effect of the proposal on (1) the character and appearance of the area; and (2) the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling, No 26 Napier Road.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. Planning permission has previously been granted for a first floor extension including raising the eaves height and rear dormer and a pitched roof over the existing side extension¹ but the scheme as built differs from that approved. The

¹ Planning Application Ref: DC/062652.

appeal site is on the corner of Sibley Road and Napier Road and so is in a very prominent location.

6. The area is characterised by traditional two-storey houses although before being extended and altered, No 2 Sibley Road was a bungalow. The ground floor brickwork remains but the upper floor and the porch are white rendered. Whilst dormer windows were approved in the earlier application the first floor as built, visible from the Napier Road and garden elevations, appears incongruous and bulky and out of character with the general appearance of the dwellings in the area.
7. UDP Policy CDH1.8² requires residential extensions not to adversely affect the character of the street scene, amongst other things. Core Strategy Policy SIE-1³ sets out criteria for quality in terms of design. The Council's SPD for extensions and alterations to dwellings⁴ sets out guidance including that for roof extensions/dormers. Given the scale, massing and design of the proposed first floor, I do not consider that the development as built satisfies these policies and guidance. I also do not consider that it meets the standard of design promoted in the National Planning Policy Framework⁵.

Living Conditions

8. No 26 Napier Road has a number of windows in its side elevation facing the rear elevation of No 2 Sibley Road. Whilst there are no windows in the upper floor to No 2 and so the privacy of the occupiers of No 26 Napier Road is not affected, the bulk and scale of the upper floor of the appeal site so close to the boundary between the two properties make it prominent and overbearing. Whilst an upper floor has previously been granted to No 2, the development as built is visually intrusive.
9. Amongst other things, UDP Policy CDH1.8 seeks to ensure that residential extensions do not cause damage to the amenity of neighbouring properties including visual intrusion. Core Strategy Policy SIE-1 includes a requirement to protect the amenity of neighbours. The Council's SPD also indicates that consideration should be given to neighbouring residents, amongst other things. I do not consider that the development as built satisfies these policies and guidance.

Other Matters

10. The proposal includes more elements than the first floor addition including a side extension and a front porch. However, I find no harm in these elements. The appeal site is adjacent to the Heaton Moor Conservation Area but no reference is made to the effect of the development on the Conservation Area. I have therefore assessed the development as not affecting a Conservation Area.
11. I have considered all other matters raised but none alter my conclusion.

² Saved Policy CDH.1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review, Adopted 31 May 2006.

³ Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy DPD March 2011.

⁴ Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Local Development Framework Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted February 2011.

⁵ Department for Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012 (the Framework).

Conclusion

12. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 26 Napier Road. It would be contrary to UDP Policy CDH1.8 and Core Strategy Policy SIE-1 as well as the guidance in the Councils SPD and the Framework. Therefore the appeal fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR