



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/25/3373016

45 Fir Tree Avenue, North Reddish, Stockport SK5 6BF

- 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 Tariq Shah against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/096144.
 - The development proposed is described as a Two-Storey Side Extension, Loft Conversion Dormer Extension, Single-Storey Carport.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - a) the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area;
 - b) the living conditions of existing and future occupants of the dwelling having regard to external living space provision; and,
 - c) parking provision and highway safety.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey, semi-detached property of brick and tile construction. A small canopy is located above the front door. The dwelling has off street parking for a single vehicle to the front with a private garden located to the side and rear. A large outbuilding is positioned in the rear garden, sited along the rear boundary. The dwelling lies at the end of a row of semi-detached properties which are positioned at the end of the street. This row of dwellings are all of a similar form, appearance and scale. As such the row has a strong sense of uniformity and visual rhythm to the front elevations. To the front of the appeal site is the vehicular access to the adjacent playing pitches. Beyond this is the off-street parking and flank elevation of No.43 Fir Tree Avenue (No.43). The off-street parking areas, and the access to the playing pitches, help to provide a sense of visual separation between No.43 and the appeal dwelling.
4. The appeal includes various elements including a two-storey side extension and addition of a box dormer to the rear roof slope. The Council do not raise any design

concerns with regard to these elements and I have no reason to disagree with their conclusions. The Councils primary design concern relates to the proposed single storey extension to the front of the dwelling.

5. The proposed front extension would incorporate a car port with a shed positioned adjacent to the side boundary. As the extension would facilitate a car port, it would primarily be an open fronted/sided addition. The car port includes a canopy which would be mounted on posts.
6. The proposed canopy would project from the front elevation of the dwelling and would be constructed up to the front boundary of the site. As such, it would fill the existing frontage of the plot. It would also project beyond the existing side elevation and would therefore occupy much of the plot width. These parameters would result in a significant forward protrusion from the front elevation of the dwelling. This would result in a prominent addition which would dominate the front elevation. Furthermore, the canopy would have a half-hip roof design and consequently, a significant proportion of the roof would be flat. This roof form would not reflect the character and appearance of the dwelling, adding further visual incongruity to the development.
7. I note that the siting of the dwelling is largely obscured from wider views in the street. However, where visible from Fir Tree Avenue, the extension would appear as a significant protrusion to the front of the dwelling. This would partially erode the existing visual separation with No.43. The extension would result in an isolated forward projection which would markedly contrast with the more simple front elevations of the row of dwellings and wider estate. The scale, siting and design of the front extension would appear visually anomalous, disrupting the visual uniformity of the street.
8. My attention has been drawn to the front car port at No.19 Fir Tree Avenue (No.19). While this falls within the same estate, it is not within the immediate visual context of the appeal site. Nonetheless, there are material differences between No.19 and the appeal development. The car port of No.19 relates to the only single storey dwelling within the street, and it also appears to be part of the original design for the estate. The design of the car port includes a dual pitched roof which, unlike the appeal development, appropriately harmonises with the character and form of the dwelling. Furthermore, the dwelling and car port have a close visual association with the dwelling sited perpendicular to its front. Consequently, the car port at No.19 is viewed as a visual enclosure of this corner of the estate. This is in contrast with the standalone and prominent protrusion proposed at the appeal site. As such, I do not find the context or design of the development at No.19 to be directly comparable to the appeal proposals. In any event, I have considered the appeal on its individual merits.
9. For the above reasons, the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore, the development conflicts with policy SIE-1 of the Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Core Strategy DPD 2011 (the CS) and saved policy CDH1.8 of the Stockport Unitary Development Plan Review 2006. Together, amongst other things, these seek development to achieve a high standard of design and for extensions to complement the existing dwelling in terms of design and scale while not adversely affecting the character of the street scene.

Living Conditions

10. As existing the dwelling benefits from a private garden to the side and rear. Within the rear part of the garden is a large outbuilding which also includes a covered seating area.
11. The existing floor plans indicate that the dwelling is a three-bedroom property. The proposed floorplans show that an additional three bedrooms would be provided. This would result in the dwelling becoming a large six-bedroom property. The proposed development would result in the loss of the side garden space with only the space between the rear elevation and the outbuilding, and its covered seating area, remaining.
12. The Design of Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document 2007 (the SPD) does not include a standard for private garden space that should be provided for a 6-bedroom dwelling. However, for 4/5 bedroom dwellings the SPD considers that a minimum of 100sqm of private amenity space should be provided¹. The SPD acknowledges that there should not be a blanket application of these numerical space standards and that there may be exceptional circumstances where a deviation of the standards may be justified².
13. In this instance, the Council consider that the remaining garden space would be 44sqm. This would fall significantly below the suggested minimum standard for a 4/5-bedroom property. The appellant has not provided an alternative figure and, therefore the quantum of remaining space does not appear to be in dispute. However, the appellant has suggested that the remaining space would be ample and functional, while noting the availability of open space in the area. They also suggest that the existing outbuilding could be removed.
14. I accept that the level of remaining private garden space, including the covered seating area, would be of sufficient size for some day-to-day domestic duties to be carried out. However, as a large 6-bedroom family dwelling the level of activity at the site would be increased. This would intensify the demand for a greater level of external space at the site to be provided. For a family dwelling of the size proposed, the remaining space would appear to be very constrained and would not provide sufficient space which occupiers could reasonably expect for such a large property. The size of the dwelling proposed would therefore be disproportionate when compared with the limited extent of external space which would be provided.
15. I note that there may be open space provision in the wider area. The playing pitches which are immediately adjacent to the site do not appear to be available for day-to-day use. I have not been provided with any evidence of distances to other public open spaces and what facilities these provide. In any event, it would not be an unreasonable expectation for any future occupants of the dwelling to have adequate external space on site, which is proportionate to the size of the property.
16. Clearly, the removal of the outbuilding would improve on-site provision. However, I have not been presented with any evidence to demonstrate what quantum of garden space would be provided as a result of this act. Therefore, I do not have

¹ Table 4

² Paragraph 7.71

sufficient information to be persuaded that this suggestion would result in an adequate provision of external garden space for the proposed 6-bedroom dwelling.

17. Therefore, I cannot be satisfied that the development would provide an appropriate level of external living space. This would be to the detriment of the living conditions of existing and future occupants of the dwelling. The development conflicts with Policy SIE-1 of the CS, which seeks to deliver development which provides satisfactory levels of amenity for future and existing residents.

Parking

18. The Council is concerned that the development would result in the loss of the approved car parking space for the dwelling when the estate was developed. Planning permission DC/054006 included a condition³ which required details of parking to be submitted for approval, and for that approved parking to be subsequently retained thereafter. The approved parking layout⁴ includes the provision of a single parking space to serve the dwelling. This is shown to the front of the dwelling. My observations on site confirm that this space has been provided and is available for use.
19. The proposed front extension would encroach onto the parking space. However, the front extension is primarily a car port and its roof would be mounted on posts. The proposed posts would be positioned adjacent to the front boundary railings. This is clearly demonstrated on the proposed floor plans⁵. While a shed would be provided at the end of the car port, the remaining space would be of sufficient width and depth to accommodate parking for a single vehicle and would be available for use. As such, the agreed off-street parking provision for the dwelling would not be compromised. Therefore, I do not consider that the development would result in the loss of an existing off-street car parking space and a vehicle would not be displaced on-street.
20. Therefore, the development would not have a negative effect on parking provision or highway safety. Regarding this main issue, the development complies with Policy T2 of the CS, which seeks to avoid inappropriate on-street parking to the detriment of highway safety.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR

³ Condition 10

⁴ PL11.C1 – Site Plan

⁵ Drawing Ref: 03