
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2019

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/19/3237398

76 Cheadle Road, Cheadle Hulme, Cheadle, SK8 5DP

- 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 Kevin McCarthy against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/073150, dated 11 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The host property is a semi-detached house occupying a corner plot at the junction of Cheadle Road and Maple Avenue (the junction), prominently located in the street scene. The host property forms part of a small group of 4no. semi-detached houses, similar in design. The siting of buildings on corner plots is a prominent and distinctive feature throughout the immediate vicinity of the site, which I find positively contributes to the character of the area.
4. The proposed development seeks to erect a 2-storey side extension on part of the garden to the host property. The proposal would incorporate features that would make it subordinate to the existing house, such as a lower ridge line and a set back from the front elevation. Whilst there is no specific policy objection to the principle of a residential extension, I note that the appeal scheme would extend the side elevation of the host property by an appreciable distance towards Maple Avenue, and notably beyond the return front building line of existing neighbouring properties on Maple Avenue.
5. The appellant asserts that the properties on Maple Avenue are viewed in an entirely different context given the distance between the rear of the host property and the side elevation of the nearest house on the same side of Maple Avenue as the site. However, I find that the particular site circumstances of the proposed development, including the distance of the property on the opposite side of the junction, from its side boundary, albeit with a section of its side space enclosed at ground floor, would still unacceptably accentuate the

appearance of the 2-storey side extension to the host property in its proposed location.

6. Whilst the proposed extension would have an element of subordination incorporated within its design and would be modestly set away from the side boundary with Maple Avenue, these design features would not provide sufficient mitigation to overcome the harmful visual effects of the proposal on the host property and its corner site location. Additionally, the proposed development would be readily visible in the street scene to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.
7. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed 2-storey side extension would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area. This conflicts with the design, character and appearance aims of Policy SIE1 of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011, saved Policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review 2006, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

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

W Johnson

INSPECTOR