
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 March 2023

by S Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/22/3307624

45 Buttermere Road, Gately, Cheadle, Stockport SK8 4RH

- 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 Mrs Rizwana Naru against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/084568, dated 9 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey side and rear infill extension. First floor extension to include loft space, rooflights and projecting full height modern glazed apex fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. Planning permission was granted on 21 August 2020¹ for extensions to the previously existing bungalow, including a first-floor extension and loft space, to create a two-storey dwelling with rooms in the roofspace. Minor amendments to the design of the development were granted by way of a non-material amendment (NMA) on 22 July 2021². Construction work is now well underway at the site.
3. The appeal before me seeks permission for, in effect, an alternative scheme for the development. Amendments from the previously approved proposal include the increase in height of a glazed front extension; the provision of a rear dormer; alteration to fenestration and alteration to the roof of a single storey element from a lean-to to a pitched roof.
4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. Buttermere Drive lies in a well-established residential area. Properties fronting the road comprise a mix of two-storey dwellings and bungalows, set out on generally regular building lines following the line of the road. The height of the two-storey dwellings is consistent. Whilst design details differ the properties are generally grouped with others of a similar type and are of a

¹ Application Ref: DC/075549

² Application Ref: DC/081941

modest scale and character. This rhythm and the consistent scale of the buildings contributes to the harmonious character of the area.

6. The approved plans will alter what was a single-storey bungalow to a two-storey property which, because of its larger footprint, will result in a building of greater bulk and massing than the other two-storey dwellings in the street. However, the alterations now proposed, including the alterations to the front elevation to create a projecting glazed element up to the ridgeline and the construction of a substantial rear dormer, both of which project well above the eaves line, will create significant additional bulk to the building at roof level over that previously approved. In addition, there would be limited increased bulk at the lower level as a result of the alteration to the roof of the single storey element.
7. Furthermore, the glazed ridge level apex would be a prominent feature on the property given its height, form, materials and projection at the front. Whilst I recognise that a glazed triangular dormer has already been approved, the apex of the approved dormer would sit just above the eaves line and thereby be significantly lower in height. It would consequently add less bulk to the building and would be less prominent in its context than the proposal before me.
8. I acknowledge that the rear dormer would be largely hidden from public view. Nevertheless, its bulky design and height would not respect the form or design of the building. Moreover, the side elevation and its bulk would be visible when viewed from the south and the building would be particularly dominant from the street in front of it. Its prominence would be exacerbated by the materials, height and bulk of the front dormer feature which would draw the eye. Taking these matters together, the resulting dwelling would be a dominating, visually jarring structure that would cause significant harm to the modest, harmonious character and appearance of the area.
9. I recognise that the extended bungalow would have been unusual on this side of the street, although it would have had some visual connection with the group of bungalows on the opposite side. As a result of its low height, and connection with other single storey structures locally, the bungalow would not have been unduly prominent or incongruous in the street scene. Accordingly, I am not persuaded that the presence of the previous bungalow justifies the dwelling now proposed.
10. I have taken into consideration that planning permission has been granted for similar extensions to properties on Silverdale Road. I do not know the particular circumstances in which these permissions were granted, which may not be directly comparable with those of the case before me. Moreover, it seems to me that Silverdale Road is a busier road where properties are less uniform in their scale and layout than those on Buttermere Road. Accordingly, the context of that development is different. Furthermore, the building style proposed does not reflect the predominant character of the area and as such those permissions do not justify the proposal before me.
11. For the above reasons the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and as such would be contrary to Policy SIE-1 of the Stockport Core Strategy DPD 2011 and saved Policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport

Unitary Development Plan 2006 which require that development pays high regard to the built environment within which it is sited taking into account of the site's context in relation to surrounding buildings and spaces, and which also require extensions to complement the existing dwelling in terms of design, scale and materials and not to adversely affect the street scene.

12. The appellant considers that the above policies are out of date and indicates that the proposal benefits from the presumption in favour of sustainable development. However, whilst the policies are dated, they are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires³ amongst other things, that development should add to the overall quality of the area, is sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment, and establishes or maintains a strong sense of place. Accordingly, the policies carry full weight.

Other Matters

13. I acknowledge that the proposal would provide further enhancements to the rooms within the dwelling which would be a private benefit to the appellant and their family. I have taken into consideration the personal circumstances set out. However, the approved NMA has already allowed the increase in the number of bedrooms from 5 to 7, and the provision of a prayer and/or playroom in the attic. Accordingly, any further benefit from the amended scheme in this regard would be limited. As such this matter carries limited weight in my considerations.
14. No objections to the proposal were made by the Council on the grounds of highway safety, parking provision or the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the neighbouring residents. I have taken into consideration the third parties comments on these matters but as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons I need not consider them further. Nevertheless, the lack of objection from the Council is neutral consideration and does not weigh in favour of the scheme.

Conclusion

15. Taking into account all matters raised, there are no circumstances that would indicate that permission should be granted contrary to adopted Policy.
16. Therefore, for the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR

³ NPPF paragraph 130