The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2016

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 1 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/W/16/3155416
Plot of land between 20-22 St Georges Crescent, Timperley WA15 6HG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Brian Southern against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
- The application Ref 87787/FUL/16, dated 25 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2016.
- The development proposed is a new build 2 storey 3 bedroom detached property on vacant land between no 20 and 22 St Georges Crescent Timperley WA15 6HG (Application No 84277/full/14).

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dwelling on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms part of a residential area largely comprising of semi-detached properties which provides a consistent theme throughout the area in terms of their design, scale and use of materials. Properties are set back from the highway and many have low level walls abutting the footway, with off-street parking and gardens to the front and rear. Due to the arrangement of properties and the spacing in-between them there is a strong sense of openness that makes a positive contribution to the areas character.

4. The proposed development would be sited on a triangular piece of land between 20 and 22 St Georges Crescent. The narrowest part of the site fronts the road, although the width does increase considerably towards the rear. The plot is much larger than neighbouring plots. Outline planning permission was granted in 2014 for a smaller, 3 bed dwelling on the site.[1]

5. Amendments have been made after an appeal decision was dismissed on this site in 2015.[2] The parties discussions have resulted in several revisions being made since the appeal was dismissed. These include changes to the width and depth of the dwelling and the distances from the proposed dwelling to No 22

[1] Council Planning Application Ref: 81087/O/2013
[2] Appeal Decision Ref: APP/Q4245/W/15/3024072

and the site's rear boundary. Consequently the revisions have resulted in the proposal relating satisfactorily to No 22. This is a view that I concur with.

6. The proposed dwelling would be positioned slightly behind the front elevations of Nos 20 and 22. Nevertheless a varied front building line would reduce any difference. Notably, the proposal includes several design features that are common to the area. These include a hipped roof and front gable above a bay window at ground and first floors. The dwelling would be wider than the majority of dwellings in the street, including those which have been extended at the side. However, the width of the proposal at the front, would now on balance, ensure the character of the area would be maintained.

7. Nevertheless, the width of the proposed dwelling, especially at the rear is wider than either the outline planning permission or the dismissed appeal scheme. Although, this in itself does not directly amount to harm, the proposal also would project well beyond the rear elevations of Nos 20 and 22. Due to the increased width of the dwelling, it would occupy a greater breadth of the site and be closer to either side boundary despite the plot width increasing towards the rear. As a result the proposal would appear cramped when viewed from the street scene. Thus, the size, design and siting of the property would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of development in the area.

8. Whilst the amount of development on the site is broadly in tune with neighbouring dwellings, the appeal site is much larger than these and of a different shape. Even though a number benefit from a mixture of single and two storey extensions, their design is subordinate to the host property and in the majority of instances respect the spacing between dwellings. Of the examples cited, properties nearest to the site do not appear to have extended as far back as the appeal scheme.

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed dwelling would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy, which, seeks to ensure that development enhances the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matter

10. Whilst the appellant considers that the goal posts have shifted, given the previous appeal decision, it appears to me that the scheme's relationship to No 22 was not the sole reason why permission has been refused. I appreciate revisions have been made with the view to finding a solution, however the Council has exercised their judgement and given the appellant sufficient opportunity to revise the scheme further.

Conclusion

11. I recognise the proposal would provide an additional family sized dwelling, however the scale of the contribution to the supply of housing is modest and does not outweigh my findings.

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR