



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 March 2024

by K Mansell BA (Hons) MPhil TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/23/3333637

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/089137, dated 25 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 31 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is change to angle of pitch on garage roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. On 20 December 2023, the Government published an updated revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In relation to the main issue in this appeal, Government policy has not materially changed. Therefore, I have not sought the parties' comment upon it, but neither party has been prejudiced by my having regard to it.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Greenbank Road is a residential cul-de-sac of mainly two storey semi-detached and link detached dwellings, the latter connected typically by garages of which a small number have been converted for residential purposes. There is a consistency to the appearance of the houses, being mainly constructed in brick with a tiled pitched roof. The appeal property at No 11 occupies an 'L' shaped plot at the end of the cul-de-sac, adjoining two sides of the turning head, which is also partly used for car parking.
5. The appeal proposal relates to the detached garage within the rear garden of the appeal property. It is sited in the corner of the garden facing towards the end of the cul-de-sac. It sits behind a high brick wall and double gates that form No 11's boundary to the road. As a result, whilst much of the garage is screened, the top of the garage door and the pitched tiled roof is visible. The appeal proposal would replace the current pitched roof with a new pitched roof of a much steeper angle, which would also raise the ridge height of the garage by approximately 1.9 metres.

The appeal scheme was submitted following a previous refusal for a proposal to install a mansard roof to the garage, which was dismissed on appeal¹.

6. I recognise that the appeal proposal would not change the footprint of the garage in relation to the host dwelling. Its overall volume would also be less than the main house, and indeed, of neighbouring houses. Nonetheless, it would significantly alter its appearance when viewed from Greenbank Road. The existing roof to the garage offers a profile that is similar to the host dwelling, as well as being proportionate to it in scale, being visibly subservient in height. Whilst the eaves of the garage and its pitched roof form would remain unchanged, the appeal scheme would lead to a visible alteration to the angle of the roof pitch and an increase to the ridge height of the garage. It would extend above the eaves height of the main house, and it would become a visually dominant outbuilding as a result. Even the use of matching roof tiles would not mitigate the harm, and the upward extension would consequently also appear as a conspicuous and disproportionate addition to the garage.
7. Furthermore, the existing garage roof and its degree of pitch offers a profile that is comparable with surrounding properties. On my site visit, I observed that the view of the garage from the turning head on Greenbank Road is framed largely by the rear elevations of houses on Northenden Road and particularly Nos 30 and 32, which share a boundary with the appeal property to the north. The pitch of the existing garage roof reflects that of the rear gable outriggers to these houses and it consequently appears visually harmonious. The appeal proposal would alter it. The resultant steepness to the pitch roof would perceptibly contrast with the roof profile of the houses to the rear, as well as the immediate surrounding dwellings on Greenbank Road, including Nos 42 and 44, which lie to the east. Such visual incongruity would be to the detriment of the immediate street scene.
8. On my site visit, I also saw that the garage to the appeal property would be visible from Northenden Road, being glimpsed mainly between Nos 34 and 36. However, due to the reasonably modest gap between these houses and intervening boundary fences, the appeal scheme would not have a dominating effect on the wider street scene along this road. I am also mindful that these properties lie within the Gatley Village Conservation Area (GVCA). Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. From my observations on site, the character of this part of the CA is largely drawn from the distinctive architectural quality and detailing of the dwellings. The Council raise no issue about the effect of the proposal on the GVCA and from my observations on site, I do not disagree. Given that the appeal proposal would have restricted visibility from Northenden Road, I am satisfied that it would not result in any harm to the setting or significance of the GVCA as a whole. However, this does not negate the harm identified above.
9. Taking all these factors into consideration, I conclude that the appeal proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with the requirements of Policy SIE-1 of the Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) and saved Policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan (2006). These policies seek, amongst other matters, to ensure that residential extensions complement the existing dwelling in scale and design and secure high-

¹ LPA Ref: DC/084155 and Appeal Reference: APP/C4235/D/22/3305932

quality design that responds to the site's specific character. It would also be contrary to guidance within the Council's Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2011), which generally seeks to ensure that extensions are appropriately designed in relation to the host dwelling and contribute positively to the character of an area. It would further conflict with guidance within the Framework that promotes the importance of good design, and the National Design Guide, which broadly seeks to ensure that development is well-designed, relates well to the site and responds positively to context.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge matters raised by a third party, including concerns about a loss of light. In its reason for refusal, the Council do not raise any issue about the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of other existing occupiers in any respect, including loss of light or privacy. I do not disagree on this point. In any event, I am dismissing the appeal for the reasons given.
11. I appreciate that the appellant would like an additional area within the garage mainly to keep and work on his bicycles, and I have no substantive evidence that it would be used for any other purpose, such as habitable living space. Whilst I acknowledge the appellant's desire to create more storage space for this purpose, planning decisions are taken in the public interest. Personal circumstances do not, in my view, outweigh the harm to the host building and the character of the surrounding area that I have identified previously.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Mansell

INSPECTOR