



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2017

by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19th October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/17/3179246

40 Beaufort Road, Ashton-Under-Lyne, Lancs OL6 6NU

- 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 Jeff Singh against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00121/FUL, dated 10 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey front and side extension, single storey front extension, hip to gable roof alteration with rear dormers and external alterations to front and rear elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the erection of a two storey front and side extension, hip to gable roof alteration with rear dormers and external alterations to front and rear elevations. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the erection of a single storey front extension and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey front extension at 40 Beaufort Road, Ashton-Under-Lyne, Lancs OL6 6NU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/00121/FUL, dated 10 February 2017, and 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 insofar as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted: Site Location Plan; Existing Elevations, Section, and Basement Floor Plan Drawing No 5; Existing Ground and Roof Floor Plans Drawing No 5 B; Proposed Elevations, Sections and Basement Floor Plan Drawing No 5 C; Proposed Ground and Roof Floor Plans Drawing No 5 D.
 - 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.

Procedural Matter

2. I note the description of the development given on the application form. However, in the banner heading and the formal decision the description used is that given on both the decision notice and the appeal form, as this gives a more accurate description of the totality of the works proposed at the property.

Main Issue

3. The main issues in the appeal are the effect of the proposed development on:

- The character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and
- The living conditions of the occupiers of No 3 Heys Road with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located in a predominantly residential area, on the corner of Beaufort Road and Heys Road. As a result both the front and rear elevations are visible from the public realm. The surrounding area contains a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced houses and bungalows. Whilst these vary in their design, there is a degree of consistency in the scale and mass of the dwellings. This contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
5. Detailed guidance on extensions to dwellings is found in the *Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (adopted March 2010)* (SPD). Policy RED1 of the SPD indicates that extensions should be subordinate to, and should not significantly alter the scale and mass of, the original dwelling. To help achieve this, policy RED5 indicates that generally side extensions should be set back from the main front elevation.
6. The proposed development would raise the height of the roof of the existing side extension to match that of the rest of the house and would alter the existing hipped roof to a gable end. It would also extend the side extension so that it was the same depth as the main part of the house. As such, and contrary to the guidance in the SPD, the proposal would considerably increase the scale and mass of the dwelling, and would make it significantly greater than the surrounding properties. This increase in the mass would predominantly be at the end of the dwelling adjacent to the road junction, and so would be clearly visible in the street scene. In such views the resulting house would appear as an overly dominant feature.
7. In addition, the increase in the roof height of the existing extension means that it would no longer be a subservient addition to the property. The proposal would also incorporate two dormers in the rear roof plane. These would be virtually the full height of the roof, and would occupy much of its width. They would therefore dominate the rear roof plane, and be out of keeping with the more modest dormer windows found on a small number of other properties in the area. They would also add considerably to the bulk and mass of the dwelling, which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.
8. All in all, the proposed alteration of the bungalow would so significantly alter the bulk, scale and mass of the original property that the resulting dwelling would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would be contrary to Policy H10 of the *Tameside Unitary Development Plan (adopted November 2004)* (UDP) which, amongst other things, requires new developments to complement or enhance the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Living Conditions

9. The rear elevation of the appeal property is in close proximity to the side elevation of No 3 Heys Road, which contains two windows on the ground floor and one window on the first floor. There is a difference in levels between the two dwellings, so that the first floor window is level with the roof of the appeal property. The Council have indicated that the first floor window on No 3 is the principal window to a bedroom.
10. The outlook from the ground floor windows of No 3 is already limited, not only by the short distance to the appeal property, but also by the vegetation in the side garden of this property, and so would not be unduly affected by the proposal. However, the proposed increase in the roof height of the side extension, and the change from a hip to a gable end, would significantly alter the scale and mass of the roof in close proximity to the first floor window. As a consequence, the proposal would have an overbearing impact on, and unacceptably harm the outlook from, this window.
11. The proposed dormer windows and Juliette balcony on the end elevation closest to No 42 both have the potential to result in a loss of privacy to the adjacent occupiers. However, the use of a condition to ensure the obscure glazing of the windows, and to prevent their opening, as suggested by the Council, would be sufficient to ensure the appeal scheme did not result in a loss of privacy.
12. Notwithstanding this, the proposal would adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of No 3 Heys Road, with particular regard to outlook. It would therefore be contrary to Policy H10 of the UDP, which amongst other things, requires that developments do not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

13. The Council has not raised any objection to the single storey front extension, or to the alterations to the front and rear elevations. The extension would be subordinate to the main property and a sympathetic addition to it, and the alterations to the fenestration would be minor in nature. I therefore see no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusion. Although the alterations to the elevations form part of the wider work, the single front extension is clearly severable from the other alterations and extensions. As such, I consider this element can be allowed on its own.

Conclusion and Conditions

14. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed in respect of the single storey front extension, but dismissed in respect of the two storey front and side extension, hip to gable roof alteration and rear dormers, and external alterations to front and rear elevations. In addition to the standard implementation condition I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to control the external appearance of the extension being allowed.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR