

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2022

**by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 25 June 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/22/3297012**

**8 Mendip Close, Heald Green, Cheadle, SK8 3LG**

- 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 Ian Trivett against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref DC/083658, dated 8 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 February 2022.
  - The development proposed is a single storey side and rear extension with associated external patio area, amendments to existing single storey extension and insertion of new first floor window with Juliet balcony.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side and rear extension with associated external patio area, amendments to existing single storey extension and insertion of new first floor window with Juliet balcony at 8 Mendip Close, Heald Green, Cheadle, SK8 3LG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/083658, dated 8 December 2021, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2156\_P01, 2156\_P07, 2156\_P08C, 2156\_P09B, 2156\_P10B and 2156\_P11B.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be those detailed on the application forms and approved drawings.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

## Reasons

3. 8 Mendip Close is a detached two-storey house situated in the corner of a residential cul-de-sac. The rear of the site is well screened by existing boundary fences and mature landscaping. With the exception of number 10 Mendip Close to the west, which is a detached bungalow with a flat roof garage to the side, the site is surrounded by two-storey detached houses of similar age and appearance.

4. The proposed extension would be modest in scale measuring less than the width of the original dwelling. It would be single storey and would not exceed the height of any existing single storey elements of the house. The depth would be approximately 5.5 metres from the original rear wall at its furthest point. Consequently the scale and mass would not be excessive or appear over dominant in relation to that of the host dwelling.
5. Although the angled siting of the proposed extension is a little unusual it would reflect the shape of the corner plot. The modern design and materials would be of high quality and together with the alterations and cladding of the existing rear extension would integrate well with the original dwelling and its surroundings.
6. The house is set back from the road and the proposed single storey rear extension would not be visually prominent in any public views, despite its angled projection beyond the side wall of the house. I acknowledge that part of the extension would be visible above the sloping roof of the existing garage. However, given the set back and the existing back drop of other two-storey houses, this would not result in any harm to the street scene.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposals would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the existing property or the surrounding area. Consequently I find no conflict with policy SIE-1 of the Core Strategy (March 2011), saved policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review (May 2006), the Extensions and Alterations to Existing Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document (February 2011) or the National Planning Policy Framework, which collectively seek amongst other things to ensure that new development is of high quality design and that domestic extensions complement the existing dwelling and do not adversely affect the character of the street scene.

### **Conditions**

8. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition relating to materials is necessary to ensure that the development would not harmfully detract from the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

*Rachael Bartlett*

INSPECTOR