



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2019 by Hannah Ellison MSc BSc (Hons)

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/W/19/3227921

26 Fir Road, Bramhall, Stockport, SK7 2NP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a grant of planning permission subject to conditions.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Lis Bolas against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/072536, dated 20 February 2019, was approved on 17 April 2019 and planning permission was granted subject to conditions.
 - The development permitted is a single storey extension to rear of property.
 - The condition in dispute is No 2 which states that:
Notwithstanding the approved plans, the materials of external construction shall be identical in appearance to those used on the existing building, or such alternative materials, samples of which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
 - The reason given for the condition is:
In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure compliance with Policies SIE-1 "Quality Places" of the adopted Stockport Core Strategy DPD and Saved Policy CDH 1.8 "Residential Extensions" of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and the planning permission Ref DC/072536 for a single storey extension to rear of property at 26 Fir Road, Bramhall, Stockport, granted on 17 April 2019 by Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council, is varied by deleting condition No 2.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Background and Main Issue

3. Planning permission was granted in April 2019 for a single storey extension to the rear of No. 26 Fir Road. A condition was imposed on the permission specifying that it shall be finished in materials to match those on the existing dwelling. This appeal seeks to vary that condition as the appellant wishes to finish the south and west elevations of the extension in untreated cedar boarding, rather than brick or render to match the existing dwelling.
4. Therefore, the main issue is whether the condition is reasonable and necessary having regard to the effect on the character and appearance of No 26 Fir Road.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling finished predominantly in brick, with an element of render to the front elevation. It is of similar character and appearance to adjacent dwellings.
6. The extension would be single-storey and positioned to the rear. Due to its modest scale and limited rear projection it would read as a subservient addition to No 26 Fir Road. Whilst the use of untreated cedar boarding would introduce a new and uncharacteristic material to the host dwelling, a significant amount of glazing is proposed to the rear elevation, the roof would be tiled, and brick would be used to one of the side elevations. Accordingly, timber would constitute only a limited element of the external fabric and would not thereby dominate its appearance. Thus, particularly given the limited scale of the extension, the proposal would not have a significant impact on the overall appearance of the dwelling.
7. Furthermore, due to its limited rear projection and the mature boundary treatment between the appeal site and No 28 Fir Road, views of the extension from the street would be extremely limited. It is appreciated the extension could be viewed from neighbouring rear gardens, however in this instance, the introduction of a limited amount of timber would not significantly detract from the visual appearance of the dwelling.
8. Consequently, the use of untreated cedar boarding is not considered harmful to the character and appearance of No 26 Fir Road and is therefore consistent with Policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review, May 2006 and SIE-1 of the Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Local Development Framework, Core Strategy DPD, March 2011, which collectively seek to ensure developments use materials which are appropriate and complement the existing dwelling.
9. Thus, condition No 2 is not considered reasonable or necessary and does not therefore meet the tests set out in paragraph 55 of the Framework. As such, it should be deleted in its entirety. It is noted condition No 1 of the original permission specifies approved drawing number: 112/025A, which includes reference to external materials and as such an alternative condition is unnecessary.

Other Matters

10. Reference is made to the requirement for extensions to be finished in materials to match the existing dwelling if erected under permitted development rights. However, this is a s78 appeal relating to a householder planning application and thus the proposal has been determined in that regard.
11. It is noted the use of untreated cedar boarding is proposed as the appellant considers it a sustainable material which would improve the thermal efficiency of the property. Whilst this may be a benefit of the proposal, this matter has had no bearing on the main issue identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is allowed.

Hannah Ellison

Appeals Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR