The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2023

**by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC**

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

**Decision date:21ST February 2023**

**Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/22/3309045**
**27 Outwood Drive, Heald Green, Cheadle SK8 3QG**

- 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 and Mrs A and K Stevenson against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref: DC/085821 dated 29 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2022.
- The application is for single storey side and rear extension.

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issues

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the living conditions of neighbours.

## Procedural Matter

3. The existing and proposed plans before me clearly show, alongside the above scheme, a rear extension to the adjoining property at number 25 Outwood Drive. Although a scheme similar to that shown appears to have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for planning approval[1], this scheme has not been constructed and I have no evidence as to the likelihood of this scheme gaining consent. I am also unable to assess this particular scheme myself due to it being unrelated to the above application.

4. As such I can only assess the proposal before me based upon the information within this application and upon what I saw on site at the time of my visit. I am therefore unable to give any significant weight to the proposals next door or the details shown on the existing plans with relation to this appeal and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

## Costs Application

5. Alongside this appeal there has been an application for full costs. This will be addressed in a separate Costs Decision.

[1] Planning application reference number DC/084583

## Reasons

6. The appeal property is a two storey semi detached house within a street of generally similar mid 20th century suburban houses. The house is bay fronted on both ground and first floors and has a driveway to the side that leads to a generously sized rear garden that is north facing. I saw on my site visit that several neighbouring properties had extensions of a variety of sizes, styles and ages but number 27 and its adjoining neighbour were generally absent of such additions.

7. The proposal before me seeks permission to erect a single storey pitched roof side and rear extension. This would extend slightly over 5m into the rear garden and would create a large dining, kitchen area at the rear. There would be a smaller element that would run to the side of the house enabling the provision of a small ground floor wc and utility room to be created also. The rear extension would be set into the appeal site by around 637mm and presumably some of this space would be taken up by the overhang of the roof.

8. In assessing this appeal, I am aware of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) regarding extensions and alterations to dwellings[2] which suggests that rear extensions should project no further than 3m from the back of a house. Despite the information before me with regards the potential for a neighbouring extension that exceeds this, I must assess this particular scheme based upon its impact upon the neighbouring house as it currently stands. Moreover, as mentioned above, I am unable to give any weight to a scheme that has no extant permission.

9. Despite the large rear gardens of these properties, a large extension immediately due east to the rear of number 25 would present a real and tangible impact upon the living conditions of neighbours here. Despite the set in and the presence of a high timber screen fence, a proposal such as this would still exceed the SPD guidance by around 2m and, were no extension to ever be forthcoming next door, it would cause a notable level of overshadowing and overdominance to residents within this property.

10. Even were I to allow such a projection using the presence of the existing screen fence as justification, the roof of the proposed extension would still raise to around the cill level of the existing house at its peak. Despite this roof sloping away, it would still contribute to a high, dominant element that would extend for some distance into the rear garden. In light of this dominance and the impact that this would likely have upon the morning and early afternoon sun of the neighbour I consider that there would be harm to the living conditions of residents at number 25 due largely to the extent and height of the extension here.

11. Although I consider that there would be several ways to design and construct an extension here that would lessen its overall impact upon its neighbour, ultimately, and on balance, I consider that the proposal before me would be in conflict with Policy SIE-1 of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) and saved Policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review as well as the guidance contained within the

[2] Supplementary Planning Document Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings, adopted February 2011.

Council's Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings SPD. As such this appeal must fail.

**Other Matters**

12. As per the first reason for refusal, I have assessed the appeal based upon its economic and environmental impact as well as the possibility of being able to allow this appeal through the use of conditions. I find a slightly positive impact of the proposal upon the economic and environmental conditions due to a likely small benefit to the local construction industry as well as some likely improved environmental conditions created through a renovation of such a property.

13. With regards conditions, I am unable to modify this proposal or find any suitable areas where an appropriately worded planning condition would mitigate the otherwise harmful impact of the proposal upon its neighbour.

**Conclusion**

14. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

*A Graham*

INSPECTOR