



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2019 by Hilary Senior BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

by P J Davies BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31st October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/19/3234488

134 Rushton Drive, Bramhall, Stockport, SK7 3LE

- 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 Mrs Georgina Cutler against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/073640, dated 3 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side and rear wrap-around extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. 134 Rushton Drive is a two storey end of terrace dwelling. It is in a prominent corner location close to the entrance of the estate. The property is bounded by a fence to the front and a hedge and wall to the side. Between the side wall and the footpath is a grassed verge. The verge and the wall are replicated in a consistent manner alongside a large gap in the street frontage formed by the spacious corner gardens of Nos 134 and 136. The continuity of the wall and verge is broken briefly by an entrance to a garage forecourt but this tends to create a pleasant visual symmetry that reinforces the spacious and uniform appearance to the street scene.
5. The rear element of the scheme is considered acceptable to the Council and I do not disagree. However, the side extension would breach the existing boundary wall and encroach onto the grassed area finishing near the back edge of the footpath. Owing to this it would disrupt the pleasing visual rhythm of the existing wall and verge and erode its open and uniform aspect. I acknowledge that the extension would not significantly affect the size of the

garden, but its siting would have a negative effect on features that are important to the quality of the public realm. In addition, the side extension would have a width of around 3 metres extending alongside most of the side wall of the dwelling and beyond its rear elevation. This would be reflected in a development of significant mass and bulk in close proximity to the highway. Although the extension would be constructed in matching materials, it would nevertheless be a visually dominant form of development that would overwhelm the modest form of the existing dwelling and fail to respect the layout and character of this part of the street scene. In this prominent location, these unacceptable effects would be readily apparent.

6. I note that the appellant intends to erect a 6ft fence around the garden area but having regard to the siting and scale of the proposal, this would not overcome the drawbacks to the scheme. Reference is also made to other side extensions in the area but none are specially drawn to my attention and I saw none that have unduly influenced the immediate context of the appeal site to warrant the visual harm from the development.
7. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy SIE-1 of the Adopted Stockport Core Strategy (2011), saved Policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review, and the Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document which together seek quality places, and to ensure that residential extensions do not adversely affect the character of the street scene.
8. In reaching my decision I have had full regard to the personal circumstances that have given rise to the need for the proposal. Whilst I am sympathetic to this need, I do not consider that it outweighs the harm I have identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

P J Davies

INSPECTOR