



---

# Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 26 October 2021

**by R Morgan BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 10 November 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/21/3278133**

**131 Meadway, Bramhall, Stockport, SK7 1NL**

- 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 Jake Simpson against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref DC/080119, dated 9 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 June 2021.
  - The development proposed is a side and front extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matters

2. Since the Council made its decision, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been issued. I am satisfied that the changes to national policy do not prejudice the cases made by either party and have determined this appeal on the basis of the 2021 version of the Framework.
3. A revised scheme was submitted during the course of the application, but this did not overcome the Council's concerns and the application was refused on the basis of the original scheme. The appellant has requested that I take account of these revised plans, but as I have not been provided with full details including floorplans, I am unable to do so. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the original plans.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

5. The appeal site is located in a suburban area on the edge of Bramhall. The appeal property is a traditional semi-detached house, which is similar in style to the other houses on this side of Meadway. In contrast, the houses on the other side of the road, many of which are detached, are more varied in design.
6. Number 131 Meadway (No. 131) and the neighbouring pairs of semis have been built in a staggered fashion, at an angle to the road as it turns a corner. Gaps between the properties on this southern side of the road allow views to the agricultural land which the houses back onto, and the distant hills beyond.

This contributes to a sense of openness, and a connection to the countryside beyond.

7. The proposed extension would project forward of the main elevation of No. 131 by approximately 2m, but due to the staggered building line, would still be set well back from the front of the neighbouring property, 133 Meadway (No. 133). The relative siting of the houses would help to reduce the prominence of the proposed development within the streetscene, particularly when viewed from the west. However, the extension would nonetheless be clearly visible from other vantage points on Meadway and Sydney Road.
8. The width of the proposed two storey front extension would be out of proportion compared with the original house and, together with the extended main ridge line, would appear as an overly large addition. The proposal would not be subservient, rather it would significantly alter the appearance of the host dwelling, to the detriment of the existing architectural cohesiveness along this part of the street.
9. Properties on the northern side of Meadway vary in design, and some have front projecting elements. However, the appeal property clearly forms part of the grouping of houses on the southern side of the street, the original design of which remains clearly apparent, despite a variety of side extensions, porches and other alterations. The proposal would fail to respect the character of the houses on this side of Meadway, and would appear out of place and incongruous within the streetscene.
10. Both the appeal property and its immediate neighbour, No. 133, have existing single storey side extensions which share a party wall. As a result, the gap between these two houses exists only above first floor level. Although this already limits views through to the countryside beyond, the proposed additions at first floor level would significantly increase the bulk and mass of the existing property, further eroding the sense openness in this part of the street.
11. Furthermore, by building to the side boundary of the appeal property at first floor level, there is the potential to create a terraced effect should a similar extension be proposed at the neighbouring property, No. 133. Whilst this may be hypothetical at the current time, it is a situation which the Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (SPD) seeks to avoid, in order to safeguard the character of existing residential areas.
12. I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policy SIE-1 of the Stockport Core Strategy 2011, which requires that development is designed paying high regard to the built environment within which it is sited. There is further conflict with Saved Policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review 2006, concerning the need for residential extensions to complement the existing dwelling, without adversely affecting the character of the street scene. Further conflict exists with the detailed guidance contained in section 6 of the SPD, as well as the requirement that development be sympathetic to local character, which is contained within paragraph 130c) of the Framework.

## **Conclusion**

13. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations which would outweigh this finding. For the reasons given, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

*R. Morgan*

INSPECTOR