



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2025

**by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 8<sup>th</sup> August 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/W/25/3359988**

**New dwelling, Coppice Road, Poynton, Stockport SK12 1SP**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Philip Kay against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
  - The application Ref 24/3061M sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 1 of a planning permission Ref 22/5036M, granted on 19 December 2023.
  - The application was refused by notice dated 10 December 2024.
  - The development proposed is a reserved matters application for erection of a single detached dwelling (dormer bungalow).
  - The details for which approval is sought are: access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Philip Kay against Cheshire East Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

### Preliminary Matters

3. Outline planning permission for the site was granted at appeal in 2023 with all matters, apart from access, reserved for future consideration. The description of development was the erection of a single detached dwelling (dormer bungalow). An application for reserved matters must be consistent with the terms of the outline permission, there is no scope at this stage to reconsider matters which were dealt with under the outline application.
4. I am aware that the Inspector appointed to determine the outline permission treated the plans submitted with that appeal as illustrative only and they were not determinative in the consideration of the main issues. Therefore the Inspector nevertheless determined the outline scheme on the basis of a development consistent with the description of development of the outline application. As such planning permission would therefore permit whatever is contained within the description of development.

### Main Issues

5. The main issues are whether the proposal would be consistent with the terms of the outline permission and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reason

6. The Council contend that a dormer bungalow should effectively be a one and a half storey dwelling, and the appellant has not disputed this. The eaves height of the roof would be set a significant distance above the top of the ground floor windows. The large three pitched roof gabled windows would be flush with the front face of the lower ground floor. The limited area of the relatively steep pitch of the black slate roof containing windows, would result in the roof ridge of the buildings appearing to be at a two-storey level.
7. The large gable end projections to the side would also add to the massing of the buildings. These features would visually result in a building that would appear to have a two-storey massing despite the incorporation of the gable windows at first floor. Although the proposed dwellings would have accommodation in the roof space the majority of accommodation at first floor would benefit from full headroom, with significant accommodation proposed at first floor. Although there are gable dormer windows, given the two storey appearance of the proposed dwellings, the scheme would be inconsistent with the description of development for a dormer bungalow.
8. The Council has raised concerns regarding the proposal not responding to its context. However, I note planning permissions<sup>1</sup> for dwellings adjacent to the site were permitted by the Council. They considered these to be in scale and keeping with the area and surrounding properties. It could be argued that this proposal responds to its context due to the similarities in the roof forms with this approved developments. However, the elongated form, derived from the attached garage and workshop would result in a development that would be significantly wider than the adjacent dwelling under construction. The amount of fenestration would mark it as a more substantial development. I also find the location of these developments to be more closely associated with the clustering of dwellings as opposed to the more loose-knit and less dense arrangement as the area transitions towards the countryside, as acknowledged by the Inspector dealing with the outline appeal.
9. Although I accept that properties in the area do vary in design and scale, The Coppice in particular has a discrete enclosed appearance and the more diminutive properties positively contribute towards the edge of settlement character. As such, although the site is relatively well screened by vegetation, there would be views of the large property from the entrance gate, and from surrounding homes, which would be visible despite planting. The overall scale would be quite dominant in this context and divergent from the smaller homes towards the countryside and thus appearing incongruous and therefore harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
10. However, even if the proposal did not harm the character and appearance of the area, the appellant has not satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposal would be consistent with the terms of the outline permission. This is by itself a reason to dismiss the appeal.
11. I conclude the proposal would not be consistent with the terms of the outline permission and would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies SE1 and SD2 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010 – 2030, July 2017 and Policy GEN1 of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Council References: 24/3109M and 24/2298M

Site Allocations and Development Policies Document, December 2022. The proposal would also conflict with Policy HOU11 of the Poynton-with-Worth Neighbourhood Plan 2016 – 2030, September 2019. Together and insofar as they are relevant to the proposal, these seek to ensure proposals positively contribute to an areas character and surroundings.

### **Other Matters**

12. Although there would be benefits associated with the proposed development from the contribution to the housing supply, and economic benefits from the construction and occupation, I am not convinced that this scheme represents the only option available to benefit from the outline permission. As such benefits are tempered. The assessment of other issues, such as drainage covered by the outline permission raised by interested parties are not within my remit to consider.

### **Conclusion**

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations, including the Framework do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

*K Williams*

INSPECTOR