
Appeal Decision

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

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/19/3235389

14 Coppice Road, Poynton, Stockport, SK12 1SL

- 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 J Wilson against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 19/2714M, dated 4 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and single- storey front extension (resubmission of 19/1608M to include gable- ended roof).
-

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 14 Coppice Road and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Coppice Road is within a residential area characterised by a mix of housing types. However, the appeal property, which forms half of a pair of semi-detached properties, is located within a row of semi-detached and detached dwellings which appear to have been constructed around the same time and have a similar appearance. The dwellings are set back from the road with gardens and off-road parking to the front. All properties in this row have hipped roofs and this uniformity of style makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of this part of the area. The adjoining semi, 16 Coppice Road has been previously been extended by way of a two-storey extension to the side. That extension has a hipped roof to match that of the existing property.
5. The dwelling benefits from a previous planning permission for a similar extension with a hipped roof (planning application ref: 19/1608M). This appeal is a resubmission of that permission with the addition of a gable ended roof.

Therefore, the only aspect of the proposal that is at issue in this appeal, is the form, massing and design of the proposed roof form.

6. The appeal property currently has a single storey mono pitch garage to the side, which is adjacent to a flat roofed garage at 12 Coppice Road. The two-storey extension would replace this garage and would be close to the property boundary. The hipped form of the approved scheme would reduce the massing of the structure and would assist in preventing the development from appearing cramped on its plot. In addition, the design would reflect that of the original roof and others in the row. In contrast, the proposed gable roof would not reflect the character or appearance of the host dwelling. Accordingly, it would appear bulky and incongruous in this part of the street scene and being so close to the boundary could result in terracing. As the adjoining dwelling has a hipped roof, so this proposal would unbalance the appearance of the pair of properties viewed together.
7. The appellant asserts that a hip-to-gable roof extension could be constructed to the existing dwelling without the need for planning permission. Be that as it may, even if that was the case and the appearance of the property altered accordingly, such development would not be directly comparable to the appeal proposal in terms of its scale, massing and form relative to the site boundary. Accordingly, this matter carries limited weight in support of the proposal.
8. Due to the scale, massing and form of the gable roof, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of 14 Coppice Road and the surrounding area contrary to policies SE1 and SD2 of the Cheshire East Local Plan (2017), saved policies DC2, DC38 and DC43 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan (2004).

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.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR