
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

by Richard McCoy BSc MSc DipTP MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 07 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/17/3176391

131 Chestnut Drive, Sale, Cheshire M33 4HS

- 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 F Dockry against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 90256/HHA/17, dated 18 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey extension to front to be built up to underside of existing roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey extension to front to be built up to underside of existing roof, at 131 Chestnut Drive, Sale, Cheshire M33 4HS, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 90256/HHA/17, dated 18 December 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

3. No. 131 is a two storey, semi-detached dwelling located in predominantly residential area close to a sharp bend in the road. The dwelling has been extended by way of a two storey side extension which was allowed on appeal in 1984. Proposed is a two storey front extension, which would be built under the existing projecting eaves and would increase floor space at the dwelling by around 4m².
4. I observed that Chestnut Drive displays a variety of treatments to the front entrances of the dwellings and this proposal would sit well within the prevailing

development pattern of the area. While I note the Council's concerns regarding the appearance of the previous extension, in my judgement, this very modest proposal would sit discreetly under the existing eaves, infilling the area between the existing extension and the bay window.

5. Its scale and appearance would be such that it would appear subservient to the host building and would blend with the range of front elevation styles to be found in the general area. Accordingly, it would not conflict with Policy L7 of the adopted Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 4: *A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations*, February 2012.
6. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of the tests and advice within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. I agree that conditions are necessary in respect of commencement time, relating the development to the submitted plans and materials in the interests of providing certainty and protecting visual amenity.
7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Richard McCoy

Inspector