
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2017

by I Radcliffe BSc(Hons) MRTPI MCIEH DMS

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

Decision date: 23 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/17/3169784

70 Edge Lane, Stretford, Manchester M32 8JP

- 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 D Herbert against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 90110/HHA/16, dated 13 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is extensions to dwelling, means of enclosure to front and outbuilding to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located on the southern side of Edge Lane which is a mature suburban road. On its northern side, in the vicinity of the appeal site, Edge Lane is characterised by large well-spaced detached buildings and occasional terraces, predominantly from the nineteenth century. However, on the southern side of the road its character is quite different. Here, later semi-detached dwellings have created a regular rhythm of suburban development of which the appeal property forms a part. As a result, it is within the context of these dwellings on the southern side of Edge Lane that the proposed development should be assessed.
 4. The Council has no objection to the proposed single storey front extension and balcony, single storey rear extension, single storey outbuilding, widened access and associated landscaping. As these features of the proposed scheme are well designed, I agree with this position. The aspects of the scheme that are in contention are the two storey side extension and rear dormer. It is to these matters that I now turn.
 5. The appeal property, with its attached neighbour, No 68, forms a pair of two storey semi-detached houses with hipped roofs. The side extension would be set level with the ridge of the house and flush with its front elevation. As a result, it would continue the form of the dwelling and occupy the vast majority of the gap between the house and its side boundary. However, the proposed gable end to the roof would increase the scale and mass of the dwelling to the extent that it would dominate the plot and result in a considerable loss of the symmetry and balance that exists with No 68. This would be contrary to the
-

guidance contained within the supplementary planning document 'A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations' (SPD) to which I have had due regard. It advises, amongst other matters, that the design of a side extension to a semi-detached property should not unbalance the symmetry of the properties.

6. An extant permission (ref 88410/HHA/16) exists for an extension to No 70 with a similar footprint and height to the appeal proposal. However, it would have a hipped roof and side dormer, rather than a gable ended roof. Whilst the hipped roof side extension in the extant permission is just below the point at which its scale would become too large to be acceptable, the gable ended roof to the side extension in the appeal proposal would be past this point. As a consequence, whilst the design of the extant permission is acceptable, the design of the appeal proposal is not.
7. The proposed rear dormer would occupy almost the whole width of the rear elevation of the extended house and almost the full height of the roof slope. As a result, it would be a large dominant structure that would give the dwelling the appearance of a property with a second floor rear extension, rather than a house with a roof dormer. Consequently, it would not be a well-designed subservient feature that respects the form of the house's roof. In contrast, the rear dormer to the attached neighbour occupies only the upper half of the roof slope and is narrower in width. The disparity in size between the proposed dormer and the dormer at No 68 would only serve to heighten the incongruity of the proposal.
8. The significant adverse effect that would be caused to the street scene by the proposed rear dormer would be visible from the rear of neighbouring houses along Edge Lane. Whilst these are private views this would not diminish the harm that would occur.
9. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the SPD. Policy L7, amongst other matters, requires the protection of the character and appearance of a locality through high quality design that respects local design features. For the same reason, it would also be contrary to a core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework that seeks to secure high quality design.

Ian Radcliffe

Inspector