



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2021 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/21/3282240

5 Stanley Grove, Heaton Moor, Stockport, SK4 4HP

- 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 Mrs Jenny Bendelow against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/081524, dated 14 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable roof alteration 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.

Main Issue

3. A previous planning application for a hip to gable roof extension without a rear dormer at the appeal property was granted planning permission in March 2021. From the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree with the Council that the hip to gable roof extension is acceptable.
4. Therefore, the main issue is whether the rear dormer would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Heaton Moor Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is located within the Heaton Moor CA. The part of the CA where the appeal site is located was developed in the early 20th Century with detached and semi-detached dwellings with established landscaped frontages giving a verdant and open character to the area. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
6. Stanley Grove is a cul de sac accommodating four pairs of semi detached dwellings in a similar design which makes a positive contribution to the uniformity and regular rhythm of the area. Whilst the adjoining property has been extended to include a hip to gable roof, and there are examples of roof

lights, the rear roofscape, when viewed from various vantage points, retains its unaltered regular form.

7. The proposed dormer would be a substantial addition to the roof and would be positioned close to the existing ridge line. It would appear as a dominant feature in the roof scape when viewed from public vantage points, detracting from the simple regular form of the roofscape.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to examples of dormers roof extensions in the local area. No details of the planning history of these properties have been provided and I cannot therefore conclude that they are directly comparable to the scheme before me. The example at No 9 Norman Road, from the limited evidence before me, differs from the appeal proposal in that there are two smaller dormers and they appear to echo the window design and align vertically with the fenestration below. In any event I have determined the appeal on the site-specific circumstances of this case.
9. Given the above, I conclude that the rear dormer would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA in conflict with policies SIE-1 and SIE-3 of the Stockport Core Strategy (2011) and saved policies HC1.3 and CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) which together, amongst other things seek to ensure that development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of Conservation Areas and respects the character of the area. The dormer extension would also conflict with the guidance in the Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document (2011) which states that they should be in proportion with the roof and not be a dominant feature. The proposal also conflicts with the statutory tests set out in the Act and the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
10. As the proposal relates to only a small part of the CA the harm that would arise from the proposal, in terms of the approach set out in the Framework, would be less than substantial. In these circumstances the Framework advises at paragraph 202 that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
11. Whilst I accept that the extension would provide additional living and home office accommodation for the appellant to enable them to remain in the area, this is a private, rather than a public benefit in favour of the proposal. No evidence has been provided to substantiate that the proposal would secure the optimum viable use of the property.
12. I conclude therefore that there are no public benefits which outweigh the less than substantial harm that would be caused to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with the conserving and enhancing the historic environment objectives of the Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR