



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 March 2023

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/23/3315265

12 Ravenoak Road, Woodsmoor, Stockport, SK2 7BQ

- 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 Matthew and Elizabeth Cunningham against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/086039, dated 19 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Proposed new L shaped dormer to existing roof, to be no higher than existing highest ridge.'
-

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 standard and complement the existing dwelling and the character of the street. The National Planning Policy Framework has a similar objective. 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.
3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached house built in the latter half of the C20th on a cul-de-sac of mostly similar houses of a consistent style. Whilst some have been altered with porch extensions or side extensions, they maintain a broadly consistent roof line with the exception of the appeal dwelling whose roof line has been altered by a three storey rear extension. That extension includes a hipped apex positioned in the centre of the main ridge which projects above the ridge and can be seen from the street. Due to its size and the lack of a fascia board on this elevation, that projection above the ridge line is not unduly prominent. However, as the street is level and the dwellings are sited on a regular building line, it has a somewhat incongruous appearance given the consistency of the other ridge lines.
4. The proposed development comprises an L-shaped flat roof dormer which would occupy that part of the roof from the apex of the existing extension up to where it adjoins the neighbouring dwelling at no 14. Its width along the ridge would be disproportionate at more than half that of the existing dwelling

and this would be emphasised by a fascia board. It would project above the existing main ridge line by some 0.63m according to the Council, with a height that would almost match that of the existing extension. It would be clearly seen from the street. There would be a significantly greater length of the existing ridge disrupted than at present and it would sit awkwardly against the roof of no 14, notwithstanding the central chimney stack. It would also draw attention to the existing apex rather than softening its impact as the appellant claims. As such, it would fail to complement the existing dwelling and would appear overly dominant in the street scene.

5. Whilst there are examples of other roof alterations in the wider area, it is not clear to me whether those have the benefit of planning permission or were carried out as permitted development but in any case, they have a different context from this site and do not provide justification for overriding the harm which would occur here.

Conclusion

6. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development, by reason of its siting, scale, height, width and design, 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. It would also fail to accord with the Framework and the Council's SPD. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector