



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/W/21/3271002

16 Fir Close, Poynton, Stockport SK12 1PD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Nick Good (The Good Building Company Northwest Ltd.) against Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 20/5775M, is dated 21 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of 1no. detached bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is part of the garden area to 16 Fir Close, located within a predominately residential area. The settlement of Poynton is allocated as one of Cheshire East Council's 'Key Service Centres'.
4. Properties in the immediate locality are two storeys and of various styles and designs, with generally similar plot sizes. No 16 Fir Close is a corner property in a larger overall plot.
5. The proposal would introduce a new dwelling into the side garden of the existing property. The appellant contends that the proposed dwelling would assimilate with its surroundings, and that the overall size of the two plots is sufficient to give suitable private amenity space for both properties.
6. However, I am not convinced by this argument. Whilst there would be sufficient private garden area available for both the new and existing dwelling, the proposed dwelling would appear contrived, being a single storey property in a locality dominated by two storey properties, and would be at variance with the ordered pattern of development, appearing incongruous in relation to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The design of the development would also introduce an uncharacteristic building form in a locality of two storey properties. The introduction of a dwelling on this site, against the prevailing pattern of development, in a prominent position would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider area.

8. I find that the proposed dwelling would be at odds with the character and appearance of the area. The subdivision of one of the large plots and the addition of another dwelling in a smaller plot would be an incongruous addition to the cul-de-sac and look out of place when seen in the context of the locality and would significantly reduce the spacious qualities of the area and have a harmful effect upon its character and appearance.
9. In light of the above, I have formed the view that the amount of built form and site coverage, and the subdivision of the plot, would be out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development in the locality. A dwelling in this location would erode the spacious feel to this immediate locality. This would be apparent when viewed from the public highway. As a result, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
10. Therefore, I find that the appeal proposal is contrary to the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to resist the inappropriate development of garden land. Whilst the site is located within a residential area, this is not sufficient to outweigh the conflict with policies SD2 and SE1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan (2017) and Policy H2 of the Poynton Neighbourhood Plan, which collectively, expect development to contribute positively to and area's character and identity, the street scene and the wider neighbourhood and enhance the quality, distinctiveness and character of settlements.

Other Matters

11. I have noted the appellants comments in relation to a nearby approval for a new dwelling. I took the opportunity to visit the site, and feel that the development context is totally different to the current appeal, as single storey dwellings are much more prevalent in that locality, and the dwelling will have a far more appropriate fit into the character and appearance of the locality.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR