



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2025

by **Andrew Dale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2025

Appeal Ref. APP/C4235/D/25/3368570

28 Ramillies Avenue, Cheadle Hulme, Cheadle SK8 7AL

- 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 Mr David Mark Savage against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application ref. is DC/095637.
 - The development proposed is retention of detached carport to front garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. In the interests of conciseness, the description of the proposal in the heading above is based on the one set out on the Council's decision notice and the householder planning appeal form. I have however fully taken into account the detailed comments and comprehensive overview of the project set out on the application form in the section titled *Description of Proposed Works*.
3. The carport was completed in July 2022. The application was made retrospectively. It is worth noting that the fact that a person has carried out works before gaining planning permission is not held against him or her when assessing the planning merits of a scheme, at the application stage or at appeal. Equally, the fact that development already exists is not a factor that weighs in favour of its retention.

Main issue

4. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the carport upon the street scene and the character of the area.

Reasons

5. No. 28 falls in a row of typically large houses that vary in design and occupy generously-sized plots. I saw that the valued local characteristics of the Ramillies Avenue street scene are its pleasant predominantly residential character, the sizeable and open front gardens, some of which are well landscaped and contain mature trees and the preponderance of hedges and shrubs on or close to the front boundaries, often laid adjacent to low walls or railings.
-

6. The detached oak-framed carport is 4.8m deep by 5.8m wide. Open on all 4 sides, it has 6 timber posts supporting a sedum green roof with anthracite aluminium edging. The near flat roof is about 2.45m high at the front. The carport is located in front of the appeal property about 2.5m back from the front boundary of the site where there is a low wall. There are 2 rows of distinct natural evergreen planting inside the line of the wall.
7. Whilst the carport is clearly subordinate to the host dwelling, the front garden had an open character before its erection. I did not see any other detached carports, garages or outbuildings in the front gardens of any of the properties along Ramillies Avenue that are in close proximity to no. 28. Although some houses nearby do have garages, these tend to be integral garages or ones that are set back from or to the side of their respective dwellings. By contrast, given its location in advance of the host dwelling, the detached carport is evidently not in keeping with local character. In particular, it fails to have regard to the wider setting of the buildings hereabouts and detracts from the spacious quality at the front of this dwelling, which makes a positive contribution to the distinctive character of this locality.
8. In terms of the street scene, the planting next to the front boundary does currently screen the carport when observing from positions on both footways directly in front of no. 28. Such planting does not however justify inappropriately sited structures. Moreover, it cannot be relied upon to provide solid or permanent buffers to views because planting is ever evolving, reliant on good maintenance and could be reduced in scale or extent or even removed by future occupiers of the property.
9. In any event, even with that planting in place, I saw that the roof line of the carport, which projects across a substantial part of the depth of the front garden between the forwardmost front elevation of no. 28 and the front boundary, has a long range of visibility when approaching along the avenue from the north-east. When drawing near from the opposite direction, it appears well above the fence on the common boundary with no. 26. In all these angled views, I found the carport to be a visually obtrusive and discordant addition to the front garden and the Ramillies Avenue street scene on account of its height, form and siting forward of the dwelling close to the roadside boundary of the site.
10. The scheme eschews the advice in the Council's Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Whilst this indicates that flat roofs may be allowed on detached outbuildings where a green roof is provided, it says that detached buildings should in general be sited so as not to affect the street scene. In particular, it advises that buildings between a house and a road in most cases are likely to appear as prominent features and should generally be avoided. In the local context of this site, I can see no basis for departing from that advice.
11. I find on the main issue that the carport causes material harm to the street scene and the character of the area. It fails to respect Development Management Policy SIE-1 'Quality Places' of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy CDH1.8 'Residential Extensions' of the Unitary Development Plan Review which, when read together, expect development to pay high regard to the built and/or natural environment within which it is sited, to complement the existing dwelling in terms of design, scale and materials and to not adversely affect the character of the street scene.

12. In addition to the conflict with the SPD, there would also be a failure to adhere to the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it relates to achieving well-designed places. In particular, the scheme is not sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.
13. The planning history section of the Council's delegated report refers to the refusal of planning permission in March 2025 for the erection of a carport at no. 30A Ramillies Avenue (ref. DC/094703). No details of that scheme have been put before me. I cannot make any meaningful comparisons with the appeal proposal. As such I have attached no weight to the fate of that other application in the decision I have reached. I have considered this appeal on its own merits in the light of the site-specific circumstances I have found.

Concluding comments

14. The scheme would evidently provide cover for 2 motor vehicles. Insofar as carports go, the materials of construction, including the green roof system, were carefully selected. The Council raised no objections in relation to neighbouring residential amenities. No local residents objected to the application. There was a letter in support of the proposal from the occupiers of no. 26 which I have studied, noting in particular that they consider their view of the green roof is preferable to the cars parked below it. Whilst I give weight to these considerations, I have come to the view that they are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have described. My finding on the main issue is decisive to the outcome of this appeal. There is conflict with the development plan. The harm cannot be mitigated by the imposition of planning conditions and it is not outweighed by other material considerations.
15. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should not succeed.

Andrew Dale

INSPECTOR