



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2022

by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/22/3296256

11 Hooley Range, Heaton Moor, Stockport SK4 4HU

- 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 A Timms against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/082469, dated 26 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 March 2022.
 - The development is a Domestic Garden Outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a Domestic Garden Outbuilding at 11 Hooley Range, Heaton Moor, Stockport SK4 4HU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/082469, dated 26 August 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P001 - Existing Location Plan and Site Plan, AS703-SK01 rev B - Existing and Proposed Site Plans, and AS703-SK02 rev D- Proposed Plans and Elevations.
 - 2) A timescale for the completion of the cladding shall be submitted for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority within 2 months of the date of this decision. Thereafter, development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved materials shown on plan no. AS703-SK02 rev D Proposed Plans and Elevations and completed within the approved timescale.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, I have omitted the words 'Retention of' as this wording is not a description of development.
3. At the time of my site visit, the outbuilding had been constructed. However, its external appearance did not correspond with the plans before me. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the plans which show the outbuilding clad in timber.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, including the Heaton Moor Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises the garden of a spaciouly set semi-detached dwelling, with contemporary, flat roof additions to the side and rear. The outbuilding is set back at the end of the relatively long back garden, near to trees within and outside the appeal site and sited adjacent to the rear boundary. The garden has a boundary onto an access track, car parks and rear spaces of other buildings. The surrounding area, including the Heaton Moor shopping parade, comprises substantial buildings and residential properties also generally set within large gardens. There are outbuildings and garages of varying position, size and appearance within the area. Overall, the area has a leafy and spacious character as a result of the large gardens, and numerous mature trees within it.
6. The appeal site is within the CA. The significance, insofar as it is relevant to the appeal, and as set out in the Heaton Moor Character Appraisal (HMCA), is derived from the development of an affluent residential suburb. This encompasses distinctive architectural style and incorporates private gardens that contribute greatly to the green quality of the area.
7. The outbuilding is detached from the host dwelling, and the upper rear part of it is visible above the rear timber boundary fence, in glimpses through buildings from Napier Road, and neighbouring gardens. Whilst I acknowledge that other outbuildings and garages in the area tend to be of more traditional design and appear smaller, unlike the appeal outbuilding these tend to be closer to the host dwelling, and in more visually prominent positions within the street scene and from public views. The appeal outbuilding is not visually prominent in key views in the CA. It is also single storey and due to its limited height and scale, does not compromise the spatial quality of the area, or the views between buildings particularly given the scale of the surrounding dwellings and flatted developments which are more prominent.
8. As stated, the substantially scaled host dwelling has various contemporary, flat roof additions and alterations. Consequently, the development being of a subservient, flat roof appearance complements the character and appearance of the host dwelling in terms of scale and form. The timber and glass cladding on the front elevation also successfully integrates with the garden setting and provides a harmonising contemporary appearance with the host dwelling. The outbuilding is behind an existing timber fence, and the proposed cladding, which would be similar to domestic fencing, can be secured by condition. This would remove the incongruity of the metal sheeting that was evident at my site visit.
9. The outbuilding does not harm the character and appearance of the area and preserves the significance of the CA. Consequently, the development does not conflict with policies SIE-1 and SIE-3 of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD March 2011 and saved policies HC1.3 and CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review adopted May 2006. It is also in accordance with relevant guidance and policies within the 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' Supplementary Planning Document adopted February 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). These policies and this guidance seek, amongst other things, to achieve well designed places, to conserve and enhance the historic

environment and to ensure a high standard of design, including of contemporary standards which have regard to their environment.

Other Matters

10. The outbuilding also accords with the general requirements for sustainable development, which broadly form the Council's second reason for refusal, alongside the requirement specified in 35 (2) of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. Consequently, as I have found the development to be in accordance with the development plan, it also fulfils the requirements of paragraphs 38 and 47 of the Framework.
11. I note the Council's concerns that approval of the outbuilding would make it difficult for it to resist similar proposals. However, should future applications for similar proposals be submitted, it would be for the Council to determine whether they are acceptable, having regard to the particular circumstances of those cases. The outbuilding before me is acceptable for the reasons stated above.

Conditions

12. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. Given that the outbuilding has been erected, and that the proposed alterations to it before me would make this development acceptable, imposition of the standard time limit condition would not be appropriate. However, as it is not yet complete, a condition specifying the approved plans is required in the interests of certainty. Though not suggested by the Council, I have imposed a condition specifying the submission of a timescale for the completion of the proposed cladding to ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable having regard to the character and appearance of the area and the location of the appeal site in the CA. The timetable for compliance is proportionate and is required because permission is being granted retrospectively and so, it is not possible to use a negatively worded condition to secure the approval and implementation of the outstanding matter before the development takes place. Both parties have been consulted on the additional condition and have been provided with the opportunity to comment on it.

Conclusion

13. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR