The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2020 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/20/3252862
14 Coppice Road, Poynton 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 20/0238M, dated 20 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 May 2020.
- The development proposed is described as a 'two-storey side extension, single-storey rear extension and single-storey front extension (variation of 19/1608M to include Dutch hip to roof and rear dormer)'.

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.

Procedural Matter

3. As indicated within the description of development above, the originally submitted plans included a Dutch hipped roof design. However, this was amended to a hipped roof design during the course of the application and the Council subsequently refused the application based on the amended plans. The appellant has provided copies of the original plans for consideration in this appeal however, the 'Procedural Guide – Planning Appeals – England' advises that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and it is important that what I consider is essentially what was considered by the Council when they made their decision (Annexe M.2.1). In the interests of procedural fairness, I have dealt with this proposal on the basis of the amended plans that were refused and referenced in the Council's decision notice.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:

   (i) The character and appearance of No 14 Coppice Road and the street scene, and

(ii) The living conditions of occupiers at No 16 Coppice Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with attached single garage. There is a mix of dwelling types in the wider locality. However, those in the immediate street scene adjacent the appeal site, including the attached property (No 16 Coppice Road), have hipped roofs of similar design to the appeal dwelling. Permission is sought for a two-story side extension with hipped roof, single storey rear extension, porch to the front and dormer extension to the rear.

Character and appearance

6. The attached property has an existing two storey side extension. Whilst the pair of semi-detached dwellings are no longer entirely symmetrical, they nevertheless retain a good visual balance as the extended roof of No 16 respects the form and design of the original properties. The adjacent detached property, No 12 Coppice Road, also has a hipped roof of similar design to the appeal dwelling. This creates a sense of uniformity in the immediate street scene. Whilst the proposed two-storey side extension would have a hipped roof design, it would have a steeper pitch than the original roof, the extension at No 16 and the roof of No 12. The steeper side slope to the roof would almost read as a vertical side which would appear at odds with the gentle roof slopes in the immediate street scene. This would disrupt the largely balanced appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings and would be readily apparent from the public realm.

7. It is acknowledged that this proposal seeks a modest change in roof design from the previous approval[1]. Whilst taken individually, the proposed roof design would not harm the appearance of the host dwelling, for the reasons noted above, it would create a displeasing unbalance to the pair of semi-detached dwellings as a whole and the immediate street scene.

8. The appellant has indicated that that permitted development rights can allow for alterations to the roof form of a dwelling. However, there is no conclusive evidence before me to suggest that if the appeal were dismissed then alterations would be made to the roof form that would benefit from permitted development. Furthermore, the appellant acknowledges that they could not be utilised in this case given the inclusion of a two-storey side extension. Therefore, I give this suggestion very limited weight, which is not sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified above.

9. Therefore, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. It would therefore conflict with Policy DC2 of Macclesfield Borough Local Plan (January 2004) (the MBLP), Policy SD 2 of the Cheshire East Local Plan, Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030 (July 2017) and Policy HOU13 of the Poynton-with-Worth Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2030 (September 2019) which collectively seek to ensure extensions have regard to and respect the design of the existing building and reinforce local distinctiveness.

[1] Application Ref: 19/1608M

Living conditions

10. The proposed rear dormer would have a flat-roof design, with a matching ridge height to the host dwelling and would span a significant proportion of the rear roof plane. It would also be positioned close to the boundary with No 16 Coppice Road. The Council are concerned that due to its scale and positioning, it would be overbearing to neighbouring occupiers when viewed from their rear garden.

11. Whilst the proposed dormer would be of a considerable width and overall height, it would be set off from the side boundary with No 16 by a reasonable distance and the window would be set-in further still. Additionally, the garden of No 16 is of a generous size and there is mature boundary treatment between the two properties. As such, the proposed dormer in this regard would not be overbearing or result in an uncomfortable sense of enclosure for neighbouring occupiers.

12. Consequently, the proposed development would not result in a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 16 and is therefore consistent with Policy DC3 of the MBLP, whose purpose is to ensure developments do not significantly injure the amenities of adjoining or nearby residential property or sensitive uses due to an overbearing effect.

Other Matters

13. Concern has been raised regarding the advice received during pre-application enquiries with the Council and the Council's subsequent processing of the planning application. This is not a matter for me within the context of this appeal and I have determined the proposed development strictly on its merits and have found it would cause harm as identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. Although I have found that the proposal would not be harmful to the living conditions of occupiers at No 16 Coppice Road, this would not outweigh the harm caused to the character and appearance of the street scene. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hannah Ellison

Appeal Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

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

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR