The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2022

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/22/3304275
3 The Oaks, Heald Green, Stockport, Cheadle, SK8 3TY

- 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 Kevin Smith against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref DC/084578, dated 9 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2022.
- The development proposed is described as 'Internal Re-modelling with new roof structure & rear first floor extension to create additional accommodation'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. The development plan includes policies SIE-1 of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD and CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) which together seek to ensure that proposals are designed to the highest contemporary standard and complement the existing dwelling and the character of the street. The National Planning Policy Framework has a similar objective.

3. The appeal site comprises a large detached bungalow set on a large plot and built in the inter-war period on a short, private cul-de-sac of other similar bungalows. Whilst individual styles vary, the bungalows are typical of their period with main hipped roofs and subsidiary projecting gabled roofs to both the front and the rear elevations. Whilst some have been extended and modified, these features give the cul-de-sac a sense of cohesion and contribute positively to its character and appearance.

4. The plans show that the proposal would remodel the existing bungalow and create a first floor level by extending over an attached garage, replacing the main hipped roof with a gabled roof which would extend across the width of the dwelling with an increased ridge height. It would also include a continuous flat roofed dormer across most of the rear elevation, a wide triangular window in the front roof slope, the replacement of a flat roofed porch on the front elevation and the extension of the front projection with a new gabled roof over.

5. Whilst the dwelling would appear as a dormer bungalow on its front elevation, the proposed change from a hipped to a gabled main roof would be a significant change to its form which would be clearly visible in the street scene

and at odds with the prevailing hipped roofscape of the cul-de-sac. As such, the uncharacteristic form would undermine the consistent character and appearance of the road.

6. The Council's guidance in its 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2011) requires that dormers are proportionate to the roof and that flat roof dormers are generally unacceptable. Whilst I accept that the proposed rear dormer would not be seen from the street and there may be examples of large dormers in the wider area, those referred to by the appellant differ significantly from this one. The example at 6 Clifton Drive is a dormer added to a two storey house surrounded by other two storey houses and is located beyond the immediate context of this site.

7. The large flat roofed dormer would not be set back from the rear elevation and would extend continuously across most of the width of the dwelling. Very little of the roofslope would be seen and it would be severely disproportionate to the main roof, resulting in a large flat roof two storey structure when seen from the rear garden and from gardens to the east and north on The Oaks and Styal Road. As such, it would be contrary to the Council's SPD.

8. I saw no other flat roofed dormers from the rear garden of the site and the surrounding properties are bungalows or dormer bungalows with smaller hipped roofs at the rear. The appellant has referred to another rear dormer at 163 Styal Road which lies in close proximity to the site but that is a much smaller dormer with a pitched roof. Therefore, the proposed dormer would not be characteristic of either the dwelling or the surrounding area. Even if a smaller dormer could be built as permitted development, that would not provide justification because the harm would be less than in this case.

9. I have taken into account the condition of the existing roof and it is clear that the property would benefit from a new roof. However, the development proposed here is not essential for that and a new roof could be provided in a more appropriate form and without a dormer of this scale.

10. The appellant has provided details of his family's personal and employment circumstances as justification for the proposal. It would undoubtedly improve the standard and amount of accommodation but this is a large plot and I am not persuaded that there are no other alternative means of providing additional accommodation that would be less harmful.

11. I have noted that there have been no third party objections to the proposal but that is not justification for allowing a harmful development which would endure beyond the lifetime of the current residents.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development, by reason of the hip to gable roof and rear dormer, would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. It would be contrary to the development plan policies referred to earlier and there are no material considerations that would outweigh this. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector