



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2025

by N Bromley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/24/3355436

10 Lees Road, Bramhall, Stockport SK7 1BT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Jessica Hadfield against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/093203.
 - The development proposed is demolish the existing timber carport and create a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to demolish the existing timber carport and create a single storey side extension at 10 Lees Road, Bramhall, Stockport, SK7 1BT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/093203, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, reference: 02 revision E – Proposed Layout; Location Plan – 1:1250; and Proposed Block Plan – 1:500A.
 - 3) No development above ground level shall take place until a detailed schedule of all of the proposed materials in the construction of the external surfaces of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and samples have been made available for inspection on site. The details and samples shall include a 1 metre x 1 metre sample panel of the proposed brickwork showing the proposed brick specification, laying pattern, and course depth, and the specification of mortar, showing the type and size of joint and colour of the mortar to be used. All pointing or repointing shall be confined to the joint and finished flush or slightly recessed from the face of the brick. The schedule and samples shall also contain details of all roofing materials, window frames, heads and sills, and details of the design, materials and finish of fascia boards, verges, eaves, and rainwater goods. The development shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved schedule, samples, and details.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 12 December 2024. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I have not sought submissions

on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Syddall Park Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

4. 10 Lees Road (the host property) is a semi-detached dwelling set within a sizeable plot in a residential area. The dwellings along the road range in style, scale, and appearance but they are set back from the road by front gardens and the street has a suburban residential character.
5. While the Council indicates that the appeal property is a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA), the building is not on an adopted Local List. As such, I have considered the proposal on the basis that it is not a NDHA. However, the appeal site is located within the CA, to which I have a duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character or appearance.
6. As set out in the Syddal Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal, March 2006 (Updated 2011) the significance of the CA derives from its development as a low density, late nineteenth and early twentieth century suburb, largely comprising detached and semi-detached villas set within large plots. Lees Road is flanked by elegant rows of houses of these periods, within generous plots, set back from the road frontage behind low level walls and tall hedgerows.
7. The pair of semi-detached properties largely remain unaltered, but the host property has a large single storey car port to the side, and 8 Lees Road (No 8) has a modest single storey side extension. Despite the existing extensions, the architectural features of the pair of dwellings ensure that they continue to make a positive contribution to the CA's significance.
8. The proposed extension, with its single storey height and its set back from the front elevation of the main dwelling, would have a modest, subservient design. Additionally, views of the proposal from the road would be intermittent, interrupted by the hedgerows and other vegetation along the frontage of the appeal site and neighbouring properties. As such, it would not be prominent within the street scene or from wider views within the CA.
9. Even though the proposed extension would have a greater width and height compared to the extension at No 8, the form and appearance of both extensions would be similar. As a result, there would be symmetry between the two extensions and despite its additional size the proposal would not unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings.
10. Furthermore, the replacement of the existing car port, which has a dominant and functional appearance would also result in an enhancement to the character and appearance of the CA.
11. Concerns are raised in regard to the design and arrangement of the window on the front elevation of the proposed extension. However, the size and proportions of the window are comparable to other similar windows of the main dwelling. The window

frame design can be secured by a suitably worded planning condition, as can sample facing and roofing materials. In addition, owing to the location of the proposal within the CA, a sample panel of the brickwork, including the specification of mortar, showing the type and size of joint and colour to be used, is necessary to ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable.

12. My attention has been drawn to another single storey side extension at 20 Lees Road that has been granted planning permission¹. The Council highlight that they sought amendments to the size and design of that proposal, as they did for the extension at No 8. Nonetheless, for the same reasons as set out above, despite its greater width and height, the form and appearance of the appeal scheme would be similar to those other extensions. In any event, whilst I acknowledge that consistency of decision making is important to ensure public confidence, I am not bound by previous decisions of the Council, and I have exercised my own judgement on the appeal proposal.
13. Consequently, for the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. Therefore, it would not conflict with Policy HC1.3 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review (UDP adopted May 2006) and Policy SIE-3 of the Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy SPD (CS adopted March 2011), which together and amongst other things seek development that preserves and enhances heritage assets and require the design, siting and scale of development in Conservation Areas to be sympathetic to its site and surroundings.

Conditions

14. I have had regard to conditions suggested by the Council, as well as to the Framework and national Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the conditions set out in the main issue, and the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

N Bromley

INSPECTOR

¹ Reference - DC/077259