
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2022

by J Downs BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/22/3303239

30 Heathbank Road, Cheadle Hulme, Cheadle, Greater Manchester SK8 6HG

- 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 Philip McCoy against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/083498, dated 22 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2022.
 - The development is described on the application form as 'to build an extension over the garage and rear ground floor'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor side and rear extension at 30 Heathbank Road, Cheadle Hulme, Cheadle, Greater Manchester SK8 6HG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/083498, dated 22 November 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: Existing site location plan, drawing number, 010_02_001 Rev A; Proposed ground floor plan, drawing number, 010_03_00G (P) Rev D; Proposed first floor plan, drawing number, 010_03_001 (P) Rev E; Proposed front elevation, drawing number, 010_05_001 (P) Rev D; Proposed section AA, drawing number, 010_04_001 (P) Rev E; Proposed side elevation, drawing number, 010_05_002 (P) Rev F; and Proposed rear elevation, drawing number 010_05_003 (P) Rev E.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have amended the description of development to that on the appeal form as it more accurately describes the development than that contained on the application form.
3. The Council's decision notice refers to Development Management Policy SIE-3 and Saved UDP Review Policy HC1.3. However both the officer report and the appellant's ground of appeal refer to Policy CDH1.8. As that policy relates to

residential extensions, I consider it to be directly relevant and have taken it into account when considering this appeal.

4. The Council's decision notice refers to the Hulme Hall Road/Hill Top Avenue/Swann Lane Conservation Area, however it is clear from the Conservation Area Character Appraisal that the conservation area is called Hulme Hall/Swann Lane/Hill Top Avenue. I have assessed the proposal accordingly.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the Hulme Hall/Swann Lane/Hill Top Avenue Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

6. S72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires that "special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area". The CA is quite extensive and is characterised in the Hulme Hall/Swann Lane/Hill Top Avenue Conservation Area Character Appraisal (CACA) as a rural suburb with a diverse range of buildings. Heathbank Road forms the boundary of the CA, with the properties beyond on Coral Road being outwith. Despite being separated from the majority of the Conservation Area by a railway line, Heathbank Road demonstrates the qualities that contribute to the special interest through the range of buildings, architectural features, mature trees and hedge planting.
7. The host property has a single storey side and rear extension which wraps around the building and is most visible when viewed from Coral Road. It appears prominent due to its width, overall scale as it wraps around the dwelling and the height of the mono-pitched roof. This has unbalanced the symmetry of the pair of dwellings and substantially reduced the perception of space around the dwelling. However the effect is softened by the mature trees along Heathbank Road and the boundary hedging to the property.
8. The use of a hipped roof in the proposed extension would introduce a new design feature to the dwelling. However, there is a considerable degree of visual complexity to the existing dwelling from the scale of the existing extension and its roof, and to the surrounding area in general from the varying designs of dwellings and extensions. The hipped roof would not appear unduly incongruous in this context.
9. The proposed extension would increase the mass of the building. However, it would be well set back from the front elevation of the property, set in from the side boundary, and have a lower ridge height, making it a clearly subservient extension when viewed from Heathbank Road. The use of the hipped roof also serves to reduce its massing. It therefore would not appear unduly prominent in the street or over-dominant in relation to the existing dwelling when viewed from within the CA. The property's location at the junction of Coral Road and the offset of the extension from the side boundary would maintain the spaciousness of the area.
10. The proposed extension would appear less subservient from Coral Road when looking towards Heathbank Road as the full scale of the extension would be apparent as the rear and side elevations would both be in view. However this

would be in the context of the existing substantial extension and as a view of the rear elevation of the host dwelling on Heathbank Road, rather than as part of the frontages to Coral Road. It would not appear unduly prominent and would have an acceptable effect on the view into the CA along Coral Road, particularly as the boundary hedge is shown to be retained.

11. I have had regard to the advice contained within the Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document (SPD, adopted February 2011). However, the existing single storey extension has such an effect as to materially distinguish the proposal from others that may come forward. I note that the Council have advised that the extension at 28 Heathbank Road was constructed prior to the adoption of the SPD. While it is a factor in establishing the visual complexity of the surrounding area, it is not determinative in the acceptability of the proposed extension.
12. In relation to this main issue, I find that the proposed extension would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA in accordance with Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy SPD (CS adopted March 2011) Development Management Policy SIE-3 which requires the historic environment to be protected, and Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review (UDP adopted May 2006) Saved Policies CDH1.8 which requires residential extensions to complement the existing dwelling and HC1.3 which requires development in Conservation Areas to be sympathetic to its site and surroundings.

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested several conditions should the appeal be allowed. I have had regard to these in light of the advice contained within the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
14. The standard time limit and approved plans conditions should be imposed in the interests of certainty.
15. In the interests of the character and appearance of the CA, it is necessary to impose a condition relating to the use of external materials. The application plans propose the use of matching materials, and this would be acceptable. It is not necessary for specific details, samples of materials to be submitted or to impose specific requirements regarding the mortaring of the brickwork as no special interest to the building has been identified, nor does the CACA identify mortaring as a specific feature of the CA.
16. The Council has suggested a condition requiring further details of new or replacement windows to be submitted and approved. I note there is an Article 4 Direction in place regarding the installation of windows however this proposal does not propose new windows to the existing building. The submitted plans show the windows in the proposed extension would be of the same design as the existing windows and the materials would be addressed by the condition discussed above. It is therefore not necessary to impose any further conditions in relation to the windows.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme complies with the development plan. As such, the appeal should be allowed.

J Downs

INSPECTOR