



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2019

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/19/3231138

7 Copperfield Road, Stockport, Cheshire SK12 1LX

- 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 Ms Sharon Lyons against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 19/0947M, dated 20 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is the end property of a terrace of dwellings located in a suburban area. Due to the positioning of the site on the corner of Copperfield Road and Varden Road, it occupies a prominent position in the street scene. As is characteristic of the surrounding area, the dwelling is sited on a relatively large plot. The presence of a substantial side garden, together with the large highway verge at the end of Varden Road, contributes to the spacious feel of the area and to its pleasant character and appearance. The dwelling has a 'cat-slide' roof feature to its existing side elevation which is a common design feature on end terrace dwellings in the area and which too contributes to the character and appearance of the area in a positive manner.
4. The proposed development would significantly reduce the spacious feel of the surrounding area as a result of its overall scale and mass. When viewed from Barnaby Road, the bulkiness of the proposal would erode the open aspect that continues towards Varden Road, and vice versa with views taken from Varden Road towards Barnaby Road. Furthermore, the side elevation of the proposed development would, by reason of its bulk, general design and prominent positioning, have a dominant impact on the street scene when viewed from Copperfield Road and would appear out of character within the surrounding area. In addition, the absence of a cat-slide roof would place the design of the proposal at odds with other end of terrace dwellings, in particular those on corner plots. These factors combined would mean that the development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.

5. The appellant has drawn attention to the fact that the proposed development would be positioned away from the boundaries of the site. Whilst I accept that the development would not be sited immediately adjacent to the boundaries, it would be substantially closer to them than the existing dwelling. For the reasons I have outlined above, this would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
6. I conclude that the development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area by reason of its overall scale, mass and its design. The development therefore conflicts with Policy SE1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2017 and Saved Policy DC2 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan 2004, both of which seek to safeguard character and appearance.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has made reference to amendments having been made to the scheme following the refusal of a previous planning application. However, for the reasons stated above, the development before me would still cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. The appellant also considers that the proposed development would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of adjoining dwellings or to highway safety. These matters were not raised as concerns by the Council but the absence of any harm in these respects does not justify a development that would cause the level of harm to character and appearance that I have identified. I note that no objections were received from the occupiers of nearby properties, but this too does not justify a harmful development.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR