



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2017

by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/17/3180343
32 Bedford Road, Stretford M16 0JA

- 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 & Mrs R Thornborough against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 91162/HHA/17, dated 21 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Sited on a compact sub-urban residential road, the property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling constructed from red brick with a dual pitched roof. It is set within a row of similarly design properties. There is an existing single storey flat roof garage/car port to the side of the dwelling which projects to the side boundary.
4. The proposal is for a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. The two storey side extension would be flush with the front elevation at ground floor, set back about 1m at first floor and built up to the side boundary. The rear extension projects around 3m from the rear elevation and would span the original and extended elevation.
5. The Council's main concern is the lack of a 1m set in on the two storey side extension. All other elements of the scheme are considered to be acceptable, and I have considered the appeal on this basis.
6. The Supplementary Planning Document 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (February 2012) (SPD) advises that two storey side extensions will normally be acceptable where a gap of a minimum 1m is retained to the side boundary. This is to retain the impression of space to the side of the dwelling and is considered particularly important within a row of closely spaced dwellings.

7. In this instance, the dwellings in the street scene are sited in relatively close proximity. Developing to the side boundary at first floor would erode the gap and adversely reduce the sense of space between properties. This matter is exacerbated by the gable roof design and height, which increases the overall bulk and mass of the proposal.
8. I acknowledge that there is currently no gap at ground floor, but this structure is a modest flat roofed addition that has a neutral affect upon the space between properties. I also acknowledge that the proposal would be set back at first floor by around 1m, with a modestly reduced ridge height, and it would not have an overly wide frontage. Whilst these design features would help to reduce the prominence and mass to a certain degree; ultimately, the overall scale of the proposal would appear cramped in this particular setting.
9. Therefore, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. I find conflict with Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy (January 2012), which seeks, amongst other things, that developments are appropriate in context and take opportunities to improve and enhance the character and quality of an area. I also find conflict with the guidance contained in the SPD, which seeks to encourage high quality design.

Other matters

10. I saw a number of other two storey side extensions in the street. Whilst I do not have the particular details of each scheme before me, several appeared to be located in different positions, for example, on a corner. Those that were directly comparable, particularly 48 and 50 Bedford Road, served to confirm my findings above. Nonetheless, each proposal must be considered upon its own merits, and that is what I have done here.
11. I recognise that to reduce the proposal by 1m at the side would be unlikely to provide sufficient internal accommodation. I also note that the proposal would enhance the living conditions for the appellants, and provide space for their growing family. None of these other matters raised would outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

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

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR