



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2023

by K Lancaster BA (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/22/3305932

11 Greenbank Road, Gatley, Cheadle SK8 4DW

- 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 G Hulse against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/084155, dated 3 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is to remove existing pitched roof and replace with new mansard roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to an existing single storey garage situated in the rear garden of a detached residential property on Greenbank Road, Gatley. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with mainly two-storey dwellings of brick construction under tiled, pitched roofs. The existing property is within a staggered row of similar properties but has been extended and is rendered.
4. The detached garage is situated within an L-shaped corner plot which projects at a right angle to abut the end of the cul-de-sac and turning area. The garage is set behind a high brick wall, with double gates but is highly visible from within the cul-de-sac. There are more limited glimpses possible from Northeden Road to the rear. The existing garage is constructed of brick under a tiled dual-pitched roof.
5. Within Greenbank Road, there are very few examples of detached garages; however, the form and design of the existing garage is in keeping within the surrounding area. Whilst there is some variety in dwelling form and style, the roof design and pitch are generally consistent, which is a positive feature of the character of the area. The proposal would involve alterations to the existing garage roof, replacing the current pitched roof with a mansard roof extension to provide an additional room, with new windows and rooflights also to be installed.
6. The appellant has drawn my attention to the existence of similar types of development within the surrounding area; however, these examples all appear

- to utilise pitched roofs in their design. I have not been provided with any additional information that would enable me to determine whether or not there are any similarities to the appeal site. However, my attention has not been drawn to any mansard extensions to garages or outbuildings within the immediate area. The only visible example of a mansard roof style being a three-storey apartment building. This is clearly a modern development, which also incorporates some pitched roof dormer features into its design. This form of development is not generally reflective of the broader character of the area.
7. The introduction of a mansard roof design would be at odds with the established roof form found within the immediate area and would appear as an incongruous addition.
 8. The proposal would increase the ridge height of the building by a modest amount, with no change to the existing eaves height. As such, the increase in height would not in itself result in a dominating or overwhelming effect. However, the proposal would not be in keeping with the design of the host property.
 9. The proposal would also introduce cladding to the upper storey of the building. The introduction of cladding in such a prominent position would not reflect other development in the area. There appears to be a degree of flexibility expressed by the appellant in relation to the proposed materials. However, whilst the use of an alternative material, such as brick, could potentially be addressed by imposing a planning condition, for the reasons given above, this would not be sufficient to address the wider harm to the character and appearance of the area.
 10. I therefore conclude that the replacement of the existing pitched roof with a mansard roof would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to saved Policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) (UDP) and the Alterations to Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which states that extensions will normally be supported where they do not adversely affect the character of the street scene and where the proposal complements the existing dwelling in terms of design, scale and materials. The SPD also encourages the use of pitched roofs. The proposal would also conflict with Policy SIE-1 of the Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Local Development Framework, Core Strategy (2011) (CS) in so far that this policy requires high quality design that pays high regard to the built environment in which it is sited.

Other Matters

11. I note this appeal relates to a revised planning application and I understand the appellant is frustrated by the lack of communication from the Council during their consideration of the application. I have also been made aware of some discrepancies within the Officer Report. However, these circumstances are not considered to prejudice my decision, nor do they alter the conclusions I have reached in relation to the proposed scheme.
12. I have found no reason to disagree with the Council's assessment in relation to the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring properties. However, the absence of harm to neighbours is not sufficient to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, having considered all the policies drawn to my attention, the conflict with saved Policy CDH1.8 of the UDP and Policy SIE-1 of the CS leads me to conclude that there is conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations which would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR