
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2022

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 MARCH 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/21/3288362

37 Hurley Drive, Cheadle Hulme, Cheadle SK8 6DH

- 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 William Adams against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/081128, dated 7 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is retrospective application for a car port to the front garden and resurfacing to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description in the banner heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice as this provides a more succinct and accurate description of the works than part 4 of the planning application form. I saw from my site visit that the works described above have been completed and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the car port and resurfacing on the character and appearance of the host house and street scene.

Reasons

4. No.37 Hurley Drive (No.37) is a three storey townhouse that forms part of a staggered terrace on the western side of Hurley Drive toward the end of the cul-de-sac. The car port has been constructed to the front of No.37 and measures around 4.3m in length and around 4.5m in width extending almost the full width of the frontage. The overall size and siting of the car port, to the front of the house, means that it appears a very prominent addition that I found unduly dominates the principal elevation of the host house.
5. The front driveway and garden of No.37 has been replaced, following removal of a street tree, with a tarmac surface that extends up to the edge of Hurley Drive. The kerb has been dropped using a series of rubber kerb ramps. The car port itself is constructed in timber, attached to the front elevation of the house with a Perspex roof at a height of around 2m. I note the appellant's comments

that the car port is aspirational and demonstrates care, but the materials and finish of the surfacing and car port do not have a particularly high quality, or durable appearance. This, in combination with the prominence of the car port, detracts from the appearance of the host house.

6. The garage of No.37 have been converted to living accommodation, but I saw from my site visit that most of the houses on the west side of Hurley Drive have retained their garages and there is therefore an overall uniformity in appearance. Whilst located toward the end of the cul-de-sac where views of the house are less public, the car port nonetheless appears an incongruous feature in the street scene as you turn the corner of Hurley Drive, detracting from the characteristic uniformity.
7. I therefore find on the main issue that the car port and associated surfacing would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host house and street scene. Consequently, it conflicts with Policy SIE-1 of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD (2011) and saved Policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) which together require development, including residential extensions, to complement the existing dwelling, be designed to the highest standard and reflect the site's context. It would further conflict with the objective of the Council's *'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' Supplementary Planning Document (2011)* and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework to achieve better or high quality development.
8. I acknowledge that the car port provides utility and protects the appellant's car from soot associated with the Manchester airport flight path, as well as weather conditions. I also recognise the benefits associated with dropping the kerb to provide a level access. However, in this case, these benefits do not outweigh the harm that I have found above to the character and appearance of the existing house and the street scene, and the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, I conclude the appeal is dismissed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR