



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

by **D Cleary MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/25/3373100

209 Edgeley Road, Edgeley, Stockport SK3 0TL

- 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 Andrew Lawman against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/095822.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey rear extension and demolition of existing chimney.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and demolition of existing chimney at 209 Edgeley Road, Edgeley, Stockport SK3 0TL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/095822, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans referenced:

PD001 Rev A – OS Plan

PD002 Rev A – Existing Plans

PD003 Rev A – Proposed Plans
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces shall be as detailed within the application and the approved plans.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area, and whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Alexandra Park Conservation Area (APCA).

Reasons

3. The site lies within the APCA. The statutory requirement¹ requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or

¹ Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

appearance of a conservation area. The Alexandra Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal (the APCACA) provides a good understanding of the APCA, its historic origins and evolution of development. The APCACA also identifies the characteristics and features that are of importance. The APCACA confirms that the appeal site lies within a phase of development which was constructed between 1897 and 1907/08. Insofar as is relevant to this appeal the significance of the APCA derives from its areas of 19th and 20th century developments, and the relationship between routes, buildings and parks. Furthermore, there is an overall sense of uniformity in groups of buildings, while the architectural quality and detailing of the buildings is also a contributory factor.

4. The appeal relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwelling of predominantly red-brick and slate roof construction. The dwelling has a prominent two-storey bay window to the front with a timber framed gable above. The flank gable elevation includes a large arched chimney stack, which is a dominant feature on this elevation. To the rear is a two-storey rear outrigger which is part rendered and part brickwork, and includes a chimney stack to its side.
5. There is a strong sense of uniformity in the group of buildings within which the appeal dwelling is sited. This is derived from their consistent age and form, along with their retained architectural features and detailing. This uniformity primarily relates to the front elevations and the presence of arched chimney stacks on the main flank elevations. However, there is a greater degree of variety to the rear of the properties, arising from the varied design and form of extensions and alterations. In the immediate context of the appeal site, the semi-detached pairing (No.207) is largely rendered, has its rear chimney removed, and has single storey extensions with varying roof forms. To the rear of No.211, there are single storey additions of varying form, including a glazed conservatory and timber framed canopy. A detached single garage is also positioned to the side of No.211 adding to the overall variety in form in the immediate context of the appeal site.
6. The appeal dwelling, together with the grouping of similarly designed properties, make a positive and strong contribution to the character and appearance of the APCA. However, I find that this positive contribution derives primarily from the quality of the front and main side elevations.
7. The proposed single storey extension is modest in scale and its siting would represent limited infilling between the rear elevation of the main part of the dwelling, and the side wall of the outrigger. The limited parameters of the extension would not result in a significant addition to the dwelling. Views of the extension from the public realm would be limited due to its discrete siting and modest scale. In addition, the presence of the detached garage to the side of No.211 would further obscure visibility of the development. As such, any public views of the extension would be glimpsed only, and would be viewed in the context of the more prominent two storey buildings. The original building would remain visually dominant with the extension appearing clearly subservient to it. It is acknowledged that the extension would introduce a flat roof form, and non-traditional facing materials. However, the very modest scale of the development along with its unobtrusive siting means that such form and materials would not visually compete with the original dwelling or appear overly conspicuous.

8. There would be private views of the extension from adjoining properties and their garden spaces, and from these spaces the extension would be more visible. However, the extension would be viewed on the context of the varied rear elevations of the adjacent properties, including the single storey timber canopy feature and largely glazed conservatory at No.211. In this context, the extension, including its form and materials, would not appear prominent or incongruous.
9. The proposals also include the rendering of the side elevation of the outrigger. This would be applied to the facing brickwork at first floor level above the extension. The coverage of the proposed render is not significant, and the elevation already includes render as existing. The limited addition of further render to this elevation would not dilute the architectural quality of the building. This would also be consistent with the semi-detached pairing, which has a much greater coverage of render to its rear protrusions.
10. The removal of the chimney stack to the rear outrigger would result in the loss of an original feature. Due to its position and siting the chimney not a prominent feature within the street scene. It has much less visual significance than the more visually prominent and characteristic arched chimney stack feature to the side. I therefore do not find its removal to be particularly harmful, particularly in the context of the much altered and varied rear façade of the grouping. Therefore, the loss of this feature would not have a negative effect on the overall character and appearance of the APCA.
11. The works are wholly contained to the rear and are set against a varied rear façade of the group of dwellings. The proposals are modest in scale and I do not consider that they would affect the important and prominent architectural features of the dwelling. Furthermore, the important strong visual sense of uniformity in this group of similarly designed dwellings would remain preserved. As such, I do not consider that the development would result in a loss of significance to the APCA.
12. For the above reasons, the development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area, and would preserve the character and appearance of the APCA. Therefore, the development complies with Policies CS8, SIE-1 and SIE-3 of the Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Core Strategy DPD 2011, and saved Policies HC1.3 and CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan 2006. Together, amongst other things, these seek to deliver high quality design which pays regard to the historic environment and seek to deliver development which preserves or enhances the special architectural, artistic, historic or archaeological significance of heritage assets.
13. I have also had regard to the general guidance contained within the Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document (2011). While this is not policy, it acknowledges that the “test” for development in Conservation Areas (CA) is whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the CA. As I have found the development to preserve the character and appearance of the APCA I do not find overriding conflict with this guidance.

Other Matters

14. I note the comments raised by a neighbour which relate to repairs and works which may affect the neighbouring property. These matters would be a civil issue between the parties and are not relevant to my determination of this appeal.

Conditions

15. I have imposed standard conditions relating to the commencement of development, and to require compliance with the submitted plans for certainty. A condition for materials to be carried out in accordance with those detailed within the approved plans and the application is necessary in the interest of the character and appearance of the building and the APCA.

Conclusion

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

D Cleary

INSPECTOR