
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2022

by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/22/3298277

15 Ellwood Road Offerton, Stockport SK1 4BD

- 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 David Finn against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref DC/083737, dated 15 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2022.
- The development proposed is a double storey side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension at 15 Ellwood Road, Offerton, Stockport, SK1 4BD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/083737 dated 15 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) This development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plans: drawing nos. PD001 Rev A, PD003 Rev A, PD005 Rev A; and PD006 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by the appellant against Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council which is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling on a corner plot at the junction of Ellwood Road and Oldham Avenue. The character and appearance of the area comprises long rows of terraced properties, in a regimented development pattern with a uniform appearance. Corner properties tend to be sited in more spacious plots and some have been extended to the side, projecting beyond the building line on the side roads.

5. The extension would be compatible with the host dwelling in terms of its overall roof form, external appearance, and materials, which can be secured by condition. It would therefore simply read as a continuation of the existing row of terraces rather than an unnatural elongation, particularly given the length of the terraces in the area. Whilst it is noted the Council's Extensions and Alterations to Existing Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (SPD) states that ideally two storey side extensions should be subservient, this is not prescriptive. Therefore, whilst it is not subservient, the overall design and appearance is cohesive and would reinforce the local character of the area and the existing appearance of the appeal property.
6. The proposed development would include additional massing at first floor and occupy a larger portion of the existing gap between the host dwelling and Oldham Avenue, but it would not fill the full plot width. Whilst the SPD seeks to retain half the available width between the side of the house and the side boundary with the road, it also identifies individual circumstances will influence the acceptability of extensions on corner plots. The appeal proposal would leave a gap, which would be visually comparable to other corner properties on Ellwood Road which project in front of the building line of other side roads, it would therefore not appear incongruous. Whilst there would be additional massing, this is not significantly different to other examples and spaciousness around the corner plot would be retained. The proposed development would therefore not adversely impact the character and appearance of the area.
7. Consequently, the proposed development would accord with policy SIE-1 of the adopted Core Strategy DPD March 2011, and saved Policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review 2006. These policies, amongst other things, seek to achieve appropriately designed extensions to residential properties, which complement the existing dwelling in terms of design, scale, and materials and respects the built context in relation to surrounding buildings and spaces. The development would satisfactorily address the requirements of paragraph 130 of the Framework which reflect similar requirements to the Council's policies referenced above.

Conditions

8. As well as the standard time limit condition, I consider that conditions which relate to the approved plans and require matching materials are necessary in the interests of certainty and to ensure the visual appearance of the development reflects the materials used in the locality.

Conclusion

9. Although I have identified some conflict with the advice in the SPD, the extension would accord with the policies of the development plan overall, and the Framework.
10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR