

---

## 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: 8<sup>th</sup> November 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/17/3180368**  
**135 Canterbury Road, Daveyhulme M41 0PT**

- 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 Fowler against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 91142/HHA/17, dated 19 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2017.
  - The development proposed is 2nd storey side extension over the existing ground floor side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 2nd storey side extension over the existing ground floor side extension at 135 Canterbury Road, Daveyhulme M41 0PT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 91142/HHA/17, dated 19 April 2017, 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 PL 01, PL 02, PL 03 and PL 04.
  - 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 Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling constructed from red brick with a hipped roof located on a pleasant, tree-lined and spacious sub-urban residential road. It is set within a block of similarly designed properties.
4. The proposal is for a first floor side extension over the existing ground floor side extension. The proposal would be set back about 1.25m from the front elevation and flush with the side boundary. It would be very similar in design to the adjoining property's extension.

5. The Council's main concern is the lack of a 1m set in from the side boundary. 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.
7. The set back of the front elevation at first floor is considerable, and will ensure that the rhythm of breaks between properties is not harmfully affected. Additionally, the substantially reduced ridge height and hipped roof design reduces the overall mass and bulk of the proposal, and thus its prominence within the street scene.
8. I accept that the proposal would not be set in from the side by 1m, however, the existing garage projects to the side boundary. Therefore, there is no gap at ground floor to retain. Furthermore, owing to the roof design and set back, I do not consider that the lack of a side gap at first floor is unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would not appear cramped in this setting, nor would it result in a terracing effect; and in this instance, the design and spacious character of the area would enable the proposal to be appropriate in its context.
9. Therefore, other material considerations lead me to the conclusion that, whilst not wholly in accordance with the guidance contained in the SPD, the extension would be a well-designed, subordinate addition that would have an acceptable effect upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

### **Conclusion**

10. Consequently the proposal would comply with Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy (January 2012), which seeks to ensure developments take opportunities to improve and enhance the character and quality of an area. I also find compliance with the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework, in so far as they seek to encourage high quality design.
11. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Katie McDonald*

INSPECTOR