



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2023 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MRTPI
MIEMA CEnv

Decision by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/23/3329729

5 Carnoustie Drive, Heald Green, Stockport, Cheadle SK8 3EW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Miss Naziya Malik against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/089418, dated 31 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is a sunroom extending out 7 metres.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal is permitted development.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO) gives 'permitted development' rights for various extensions to domestic properties subject to a prior approval process and various conditions¹. This means that certain extensions do not require planning permission.
5. The appeal property is one in a row of semi-detached two-storey dwellings which are attached via single storey garages to the side. The planning application form states that the proposed sunroom would extend to a depth of 7 metres.
6. Paragraph A.1(g) sets out that a proposal would not be 'permitted development' if an extension would extend beyond the rear wall of the original

¹ Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, paragraph A.1(g)

dwellinghouse by more than 6 metres for this type of dwelling. Therefore, the proposal exceeds the 'permitted development' allowance.

7. In coming to the above view, I acknowledge that the submitted proposed ground floor plan indicates that the sunroom dimensions would be 7 metres by 5 metres. However, it is unclear from the plan which measurement represents the depth or width of the extension. This is particularly the case as other room dimensions indicate that the first measurement would be front to back and this would suggest that the rearward extension would project 7 metres out from the rear of the host dwelling. The appellant has sought to clarify this in their appeal statement which states that the proposed sunroom would extend to a depth of 5 metres and would be 7 metres wide (although it is further suggested that the extension would be 8 metres in width).
8. It follows that the submitted drawing is not an accurate depiction of what is being proposed. That said, my consideration of this appeal must be based on the proposal described in the planning application form. To that end, I find that the proposal would not be permitted development.
9. The Council have also raised concern that no details of the proposed materials have been provided. However, for this procedure, there is no requirement for such detail to be submitted. That said, any development must comply with condition A.3(a) which states that the materials used in any exterior work (other than materials used in the construction of a conservatory) must be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse.
10. In summary, the development cannot benefit from the permitted development rights given by Class A and therefore planning permission is required for the proposal. Therefore, the appeal must be dismissed.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. It is therefore considered that the proposal does not meet with the requirements as set out and conflicts with the requirements of sub-paragraph A.1(g) in Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended).
12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence, and my representative's report, and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR