



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2021

by R Morgan BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/21/3279348

18 Lumb Lane, Bramhall, STOCKPORT, SK7 2BA

- 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 Bryn Davies against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/080372, dated 23 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is removal of existing detached garage and erection of replacement single-storey double garage and garden office.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

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 materially affect the issues raised or prejudice the cases made by either party, and have determined this appeal in light of the 2021 version of the Framework.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located in a predominately residential area close to Bramhall Village. Properties in the wider area vary considerably in style, design and age, but 18 Lumb Lane (No. 18) forms one of a group of similarly designed dwellings which front onto Lumb Lane, Gawsorth Close and Moreton Avenue.
5. The houses along Lumb Lane which form part of this grouping are well set back from the road, with good sized gardens to the front and side. Wide, grassed corner verges lined with hedges contribute to the green and spacious character of this part of the street, and the substantial area of amenity space in front of Lumb Cottage and Lumb House, on the other side of the road, further add to the feeling of spaciousness along this section of Lumb Lane.
6. No. 18 forms half of an irregular pair of semi detached houses, with its front gable facing onto Gawsorth Close and a large side garden along Lumb Lane.

The garden contributes to the open character of the area, providing a gap in built form between the appeal property and a row of older townhouses, the last of which is neighbouring property 12 Lumb Lane.

7. The siting of the proposed garage/home office would be appropriately set back from the street and would reflect the building line of 12 Lumb Lane. However, the footprint of the proposed building would be greater than that of the main, two storey part of the house, with the long side elevation facing onto Lumb Lane occupying a significant part of the garden. Large outbuildings are not a feature of the streetscene, and the proposed building would appear out of scale in relation to the existing dwelling.
8. The steeply pitched roof would reflect the roofs of other buildings around, but at around 3m, the eaves would be well above the height of the adjacent boundary hedge. Although single storey, the proposed garage would be of significant height as well as length along the Lumb Lane frontage. The existing evergreen hedge would provide partial screening, but the proposed building would be considerably higher than the hedge and would appear overly large, particularly when viewed from the other side of Lumb Lane and its junction with Gawsword Close.
9. Owing to its size and overall height, the building would be a prominent addition to the streetscene which would harmfully erode the gap in built form and the spacious quality of this part of the street. The current view of the blank side elevation of 12 Lumb Lane is broken up by a single storey element and does not appear as an obtrusive feature in the streetscene. As such, obscuring it would not be a benefit of the proposed scene.
10. The proposed garage/home office and play room would provide valuable space to meet the needs of the family as it grows, whilst retaining a reasonable amount of outdoor space. It would not cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, and the choice of materials would be acceptable. However, these factors would not outweigh the harm to the streetscene that would be caused as a result of the excessive scale and height of the building.
11. I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies SIE-1 and CS8 of the Stockport Core Strategy 2011, which require development to be of a high quality design, taking account of the site's context in relation to surrounding buildings and spaces, and having regard to height and massing. There would be further conflict with Policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan 2006, which requires that residential extensions do not adversely affect the character of the street scene.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and no other considerations outweigh this finding. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR