



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2025

by J D Westbrook BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/D/25/3374423

18 Leaffield Drive, Cheadle Hulme, SK8 6NT

- 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 Beverley Davies against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/096202
 - The development proposed is the construction of a first-floor extension to existing single-storey side extension, a hip-to-gable roof conversion with a raised ridge and a rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal property includes two two-storey buildings. From the information before me regarding the history of the site, it would appear that these were intended to comprise the main host dwelling and a large two-storey extension. From the current submitted plans and my site visit, it would appear that the two buildings, in fact, operate as separate dwellings, and this is confirmed in the initial paragraph of the appellant's appeal statement. I will refer to this apparent anomaly in my considerations below.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions and alterations on the character and appearance of the area around Leaffield Drive and Woking Road.

Reasons

4. The appeal property occupies a corner plot at the junction of Leaffield Drive and Woking Road. It would appear from the submitted plans and evidence on site that the property is, in practice, split into two separate plots – one which includes the original two-storey dwelling (building A), set at an angle to the junction, and the other by a two-storey building (building B) which effectively fronts Woking Road and was granted permission by the Council in 2012 as an extension to the host dwelling. The current proposal relates to extensions and alterations to building B.
5. Building B is a two-storey structure with a hipped roof and a triangular single-storey extension to the side. The side extension is built up against a small single-storey extension to the side of building A, and contains the front door to building B.

Building B has a lounge/dining/kitchen area, with a utility room, to the ground floor and two bedrooms to the first floor. At the rear of the building is a very small decked patio area, separated from the rear garden of building A by a 1.8 metre fence, and a small shed. To the front is the only effective private amenity area, which is surrounded by 1.8 metre fences and the rear of a wooden outbuilding that is sited in the front garden of building A. The fencing also separates the front amenity area from the parking area to the front of the building, with access from Woking Road.

6. The submitted floor plans and elevations show no interconnection between the two buildings, and building B is effectively physically separated from building A by continuous fencing which links outbuildings with extensions, albeit with a small 1.8 metre high wooden gate in the rear fence between the two plots.
7. The proposed development would involve the construction of a first-floor bedroom above the existing side extension and which would have a flat roof. It would also involve the conversion of the existing hipped roof to a gable-ended roof by way of raising the roof ridge by some 0.8 metres and the construction of a full-height and full-width dormer to the rear roof slope in order to create a further bedroom.
8. Policy SIE 1 of the Councils Core Strategy (CS) indicates that development that is designed to the highest contemporary standard, paying high regard to the built environment within which it is sited, will be given positive consideration. Specific account should be had to the site's characteristics as well as the site's context in relation to surrounding buildings, particularly with regard to the height, density and massing of buildings.
9. Saved Policy CDH1.8 of the Councils Unitary Development Plan (UDP) requires that extensions should complement the existing dwelling in terms of size, scale and materials, and should not adversely affect the character of the street scene.
10. The Council's adopted 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) notes that any extensions or alterations to a property should respect the form, shape, and proportions of the existing dwelling, and should complement the character of the surrounding area. In addition, they should generally appear subordinate in relation to the existing dwelling in terms of massing, scale and overall appearance. Finally they should provide good standards of amenity and privacy for future occupiers and neighbouring occupiers.
11. The Council contends that the proposed hip-to-gable roof conversion and raising of the roof height, by reason of its form and height results in a visually obtrusive feature in the street scene that is a complete contrast to existing roof forms within the street scene, causing harm to the character of the area.
12. Building B currently has a hipped roof to match the character and appearance of that at building A and the adjacent No 75 Woking Road, with a similar scale and height. Along Leafield Road and Woking Road in the vicinity of the appeal site, all original buildings have hipped roofs of similar scale and height to that of buildings A and B. I acknowledge that some houses in the vicinity have two-storey side extensions, but these either retain the characteristic hipped nature of the roofs in the area or, if with gable ends, are seen as subordinate to the host dwelling with extensions set back from the front elevation and/or set down from the ridge of the main roof. Either way, the essential character and appearance of the area is preserved.

13. The proposed hip-to-gable alteration at building B would appear as a significantly uncharacteristic feature. In addition, the increase in ridge height would give the building an unsympathetic top-heavy appearance, emphasised by the large scale of the rear dormer, which would be readily visible in the street scene from viewpoints around the junction.
14. I accept that the existing single-storey side extension is of an unusual triangular nature and that this would make construction of a roof of sympathetic design above the first floor difficult. However, the flat roof, as proposed, would also be an uncharacteristic and unattractive feature in the street scene which would add to the harm to the surrounding area resulting from the proposal as a whole.

Other Matters

15. The two buildings on the original plot of No 18 Leafield Drive have the nature of two separate dwellings with a continuous boundary between them. The result is that building B occupies a relatively small area, with a very small rear private amenity area, and half of the small front garden as the only effective usable amenity space. To add two further bedrooms would, in my opinion, result in a very cramped property with a poor standard of amenity for current and future occupiers. In addition, if the buildings are to be considered as two separate dwellings, the degree of overlooking from the rear of building B to the small rear amenity space remaining with building A would represent harm to the privacy of the occupiers of building A, and this would be made worse with the creation of a large rear dormer extension.
16. From the information available to me, it would appear that the two buildings are currently occupied by members of the same family grouping. However, given the separate nature of the buildings on separated plots, this may not always be the situation and, in any case, the creation of two additional bedrooms on the combined site would, in my opinion, represent overdevelopment of the area available and would be of a cramped nature uncharacteristic of the surrounding area.

Conclusion

17. In conclusion, I find that the proposed extensions and alterations at No 18 Leafield Drive would not complement the existing building in terms of size, form or design, and would adversely affect the character and appearance of the street scene. With regard to the roof alterations and rear dormer in particular, they would appear top-heavy and not subordinate to the host building. Finally, the increased scale of the building would result in a cramped development on the available area with sub-standard private amenity space. On this basis, the proposal would conflict with Policy SIE 1 of the CS, Policy CDH 1.8 of the UDP and with guidance on the design of extensions and alterations in the SPD. Accordingly, I dismiss this appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR