
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: 19 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/21/3280682

14 Marsham Road, Hazel Grove, Stockport, SK7 5JB

- 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 David and Shelley Goodman against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/081404, dated 3 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is installation of a rear dormer window, alterations to existing roof including raising of ridge height and removal of chimney stack.
-

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 Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the host and neighbouring dwellings, and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular regard to privacy.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. The host dwelling is a detached two storey property, set back from the road in a residential area with a mix of one and two storey dwellings in varying architectural styles. To the rear of the dwelling the garden area adjoins the rear gardens of the dwellings on St Johns Road and Mostyn Road.
5. The proposal would increase the roof height and include a substantial flat roof dormer on the rear elevation, which would extend to the ridge line. Whilst the dormer would be stepped in from the sides of the roof it would cover the majority of the rear roof plane of the dwelling. The proportions and scale of the substantial box form would overwhelm the rear roof slope unbalancing the appearance of the rear of the dwelling. Moreover, the proposed windows would

fail to align or balance with the fenestration on the host property's rear elevation and taken as a whole, the proposal would be an unsympathetic addition to the dwelling.

6. Furthermore, the host dwelling is one of the highest in the local area and although the raising of the roof height would be limited in extent, it would result in an overly prominent dwelling in the streetscene. The proposal would erode the contribution the host dwelling makes to the character and appearance of the area.
7. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy SIE-1 of the Stockport Core Strategy (2011) and saved Policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) which together seek to ensure, amongst other things, that developments are of a high standard of design, are well proportioned and enhance the quality of the area. The extension would also conflict with the guidance in the Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document (2011) which states that dormers should be in proportion with the roof, have a pitched roof and echo the window design vertically with the fenestration below. The proposal also conflicts with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Living conditions

8. In built up areas there is often a degree of mutual overlooking which I observed on the site visit. However, in this case, I observed that neighbouring rear gardens were largely private as a result of the orientation of nearby dwellings and window placements and designs.
9. Whilst the windows in the proposed dormer would be unlikely to result in a loss of privacy to the rear rooms of neighbouring dwellings given the distances involved, due to the height of the windows within it and the windows being in areas of the rear elevation that previously did not have windows in it, there would be direct overlooking from them into the rear garden environment of neighbouring dwellings. As a consequence, there would be a high probability that neighbouring rear gardens would not be as private once the proposal was constructed. These outdoor areas would be less pleasant to use as a result.
10. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposed development would result in a loss of privacy to, and harm the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers in conflict with Policy SIE-1 of the Stockport Core Strategy (2011) and saved policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) which together seek to ensure, amongst other things, that developments are of a high standard of design and do not adversely affect the amenity of residents. There would also be conflict with the SPD which seeks to ensure that harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers is not caused, as well as the amenity objectives of the Framework.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has indicated that the property could be extended under permitted development rights but acknowledges that the proposal would be different and would include a smaller dormer extension than the subject of the appeal. In addition, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country

Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) sets out the limitations and conditions to be considered in determining the application and requires the applicant to apply to the Council. Any fallback position created by the various permitted development rights are subject to conditions, limitations and restrictions and no such schemes are before me, therefore these matters have not been decisive in this case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. 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

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR