
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2025

by **T Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/W/25/3364256

161 Broadstone Hall Road South, Heaton Chapel, Stockport SK4 5JD

- 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 A Clavin against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/093397.
 - The development proposed is a Detached House.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The original planning application was refused for three reasons. Two of those reasons, 2 and 3, respectively related to a failure to make provision for recreation and amenity open space and concerns over a lack of information with regard to surface water drainage.
3. Within their statement the Council note that refusal reason 1 was the substantive reason for refusal and note that refusal reasons 2 and 3 could be resolved through a legal agreement and via condition. I consider that it would be reasonable for me to condition a surface water drainage scheme for this proposal, were I minded to allow the appeal.
4. The appeal is accompanied by a completed planning obligation in the form of a unilateral undertaking to a financial contribution towards the cost of enhancing existing public open space facilities and funding the provision and maintenance of children's play and formal recreation areas within the Borough.
5. The evidence indicates that the provision within the planning obligation is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. It is directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind and therefore meets the relevant tests¹.

Main Issues

6. The main issues therefore are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of future occupiers.

¹ Within Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024.

Character and appearance

7. The site is set to the rear of 161 Broadstone Hall Road South (No.161). That property is semi-detached, as are many of the properties on this side of the adjacent railway line which runs along an embankment close to the site. The area has a typically suburban spacious character with the majority of properties regularly spaced, often with well sized rear gardens. That is the case for properties on this section of Broadstone Hall Road South along with nearby Bollington Road.
8. Whilst some properties include outbuildings within their gardens, the introduction of a standalone residential dwelling close to the rear of No.161 would run contrary to the strongly established character and appearance of the area. It is unlikely that the proposed dwelling would be an obvious feature from public areas. However, it would be noticeable from properties on Broadstone Hall Road South and Bollington Road.
9. From here, the proposed dwelling would form an uncharacteristically large structure within an area dominated by residential gardens. Further, the proposal would introduce domestic activity associated with a dwelling deep to the rear of Broadstone Hall Road South where domestic gardens with a quiet and settled character dominate. Whilst I note that the SPD² appears to offer support to imaginative design solutions in terms of considering a flexible approach to space between new buildings, the proposal would not respond to the local character and context.
10. The proposed dwelling would therefore have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would subsequently conflict with policies SIE-1 and H-1 of the Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy DPD (2011) (DPD) which amongst other things state that development that is designed to pay high regard to the built environment within which it is sited will be given positive consideration. Further, with regard to the design of residential development, proposals should amongst other things respond to the townscape character of the local area.

Living conditions

11. The dwelling would exceed the minimum floor area set out within the Nationally Described Space Standard³ and would not have any significant adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in terms of matters including privacy, overlooking, light or overshadowing. The layout and window arrangement has clearly been given some thought.
12. However, despite the inclusion of a large window on the south facing elevation of the property future residents would be to a large degree dependant on outlook from the east facing elevation which would include a bedroom window, door with side panels and three windows serving the combined kitchen and living area.
13. The east facing elevation of the property would be in close proximity to the well planted embankment on which the adjacent railway line runs. Given its notable height and the extensive presence of planting, the outlook for future occupiers

² Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Local Development Framework – The Design of Residential Development – Supplementary Planning Document – December 2007.

³ Department for Communities and Local Government – Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard.

would be likely to be substantially constrained, which would harm their living conditions.

14. I accept that in some circumstances, a less than extensive outlook could on occasion be acceptable within a denser urban environment. However, within this location, which has a more spacious character, the outlook would not be acceptable and would cause significant harm to the living conditions of future occupiers. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy H-1 of the DPD which amongst other things requires good standards of amenity for the occupants of new housing.

Planning Balance

15. The Council does not have a five year housing land supply and given the figure of 1.77 years the evidence indicates that the shortfall is significant. Paragraph 11d) of the Framework⁴ is therefore of relevance. Paragraph 11d) i) is not relevant in this case.
16. Within the context of the shortfall, I afford significant weight to the provision of a new dwelling which would be sustainably located in terms of access to services, facilities and transport links.
17. It could be well insulated, would include a green roof, and there would appear to be little risk of flooding to the site, with low risk of contamination. These matters are afforded limited weight in favour of the proposal.
18. Whilst I note that this proposal represents an alternative form of development which seeks to address refusal reasons relating to an earlier scheme, it would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of future occupiers, matters to which I afford substantial weight. There would be conflict with policies SIE-1 and H-1 of the DPD and the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole.
19. The Framework states that development which is not well designed should be refused. Such a requirement is reflective of the approach of policies SIE-1 and H-1 of the DPD which in broad terms seek good design. I therefore afford substantial weight to the policy conflict.
20. Consequently, the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole and having regard to key policies for amongst other things securing well designed places. The proposal does not therefore benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Conclusion

21. The proposal would conflict with the DPD as a whole and the harms would not be outweighed by the benefits. There are no considerations which indicate that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

T Burnham INSPECTOR

⁴ National Planning Policy Framework 2024.