

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2017

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 08 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U4230/D/17/3173634

42 Holden Drive, Pendlebury, Swinton, Manchester, M27 4FR

- 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 Steve Woods against the decision of Salford City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/69082/HH, dated 7 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single-storey side extension at 42 Holden Drive, Pendlebury, Swinton, Manchester, M27 4FR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/69082/HH, dated 7 November 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed site plan; Drawing Nos 01 and 03.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area around Holden Drive and Hospital Road.

Reasons

3. No 42 is a narrow-fronted, three-storey semi-detached house on a corner plot at the junction of Holden Drive with Hospital Road. In common with most other houses in the area, it is constructed of red brick with a grey tiled roof. It has a pitched roof with a gable end. Although the postal address is Holden Drive, the property, along with the adjoining semi-detached house and neighbouring terraced houses, faces Hospital Road, from which it is separated by an access road and parking area. It has an open plan frontage with a side wall/fence some 1.8 metres high, which is some 2.2 metres from the side elevation of the house and around 1.2 metres from the back of the pavement. The wall curves round to the rear boundary where it increases in height to around 2 metres.
-

4. The proposed development would involve the construction of a single-storey, side extension, around 2.2 metres wide, with a front elevation continuing that of the main house and a rear elevation set back some 0.6 metres from the existing rear elevation of the house. It would be constructed of matching materials to the main dwelling and would have a hipped, tiled roof. It would be some 2.4 metres high to the eaves, and nearly 3.5 metres high overall.
5. The Council contends as a result of its size and design the proposed side extension would not respect the character or proportions of the host dwelling and would be an incongruous addition to the dwelling. It also contends that the proposed extension would sit forward of the established building line along Holden Road which would make the extension visually prominent within the street scene and have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area.
6. The host dwelling is a narrow-fronted, three-storey house. The proposed development would result in a narrow, single-storey side extension that would match the existing materials and window designs of the main house. Whilst it would be relatively low, compared with the host property, it would mirror the scale of the detached garage building at the rear of the property, and would be of a similar height to the more prominent day nursery building on the opposite corner plot. There are a number of properties with hipped-roofs in the immediate vicinity, chiefly on corner plots or at the end of short terraces, including elements of the day nursery and the large block of refurbished flats at Oaklands Lodge.
7. The side elevation of the extension would approximately equate to the line of the existing boundary wall. It would be a little over 0.5 metres higher than the existing wall at the boundary, but I do not consider that this would have a significantly detrimental effect on the street scene, since it would be only around 9 metres long, and the rest of the boundary would remain unaltered.
8. The building line along the north side of Holden Drive is very uneven. Houses on the corner plots at the junction of Holden Drive and Sillavan Close project over a metre out from the current side elevation of No 42, while the houses beyond are set significantly further back. In addition, the houses on the corner plots of Hospital Road with Liebert Drive, opposite to the appeal property, are set with a side elevation close to the back of the pavement, such that it is somewhat characteristic of buildings on corner plots to be set closer to the road than the houses in between. In this respect, the proposal at No 42, which would, in any case, remain set in around 1.2 metres from the back of the pavement, would not appear out of character with its surroundings or the general tone of the layout of properties in the wider estate.
9. In conclusion, I find that the appeal property is set well back from Hospital Road and is not prominent in the street scene, being largely obscured by the more prominent day nursery building when approaching from the south, and somewhat overshadowed by the scale of Oaklands Lodge to the north. The proposed extension would have no significant impact on the building line along Holden Drive which is, in any case, very uneven, and it would not appear uncharacteristic in the area due to the way that corner plots are treated in the overall design of the wider estate. Finally, whilst it would be only single-storey, it would not appear out of context with the garage building to the immediate rear of the property or with the day nursery building opposite.

10. On the basis of the above, I find that the proposal would not be detrimental to the character or appearance of the area around Holden Drive and Hospital Road, and that it would not conflict with Policies DES1 and DES8 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan which require new developments, including alterations and extensions, to respect and complement the character of the local area and the original building.

Conditions

11. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR