



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2019 by C McDonagh BA (Hons), MA

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/19/3230143

38 Westmorland Road, Urmston, M41 9HL

- 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 Mrs Christine Adams against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 96686/HHA/19, dated 26 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is amendments to planning approval ref 93917/HHA/18.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the planning application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the description offered by the Council of "*Erection of part single/part two storey rear and single storey side extension*" in the decision notice more accurately describes the appeal.
4. Furthermore, it was clear from the site visit that the development has been completed and the appeal is therefore considered on a retrospective basis. The Council has referred only to the two-storey rear extension element of the works in its reason for refusal and does not take issue with the single-storey rear and side extensions. As such, I have focused only on the two-storey rear extension.

Main Issues

5. The main issues for consideration in this appeal are the effects of the works on the character and appearance of the host building and wider area, and on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.40 Westmorland Road.

Reasons

Character and appearance of host building and wider area

6. The appeal site is set in a residential area of Urmston and comprises a semi-detached dwelling with red brick and rendered facing walls and a pitched gable roof to the front. This side of Westmorland Road features houses which are largely matching and unaltered to the front, although various extensions are prevalent to the rear.
7. The proposal involves a part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension as well as a single-storey side extension. The two-storey rear element is flat roofed and sits flush with the existing outrigger. Evidently the works were carried out in accordance with a refused application (ref 92480/HHA/17) rather than those approved under 93917/HHA/18, which allowed a more limited projection.
8. The Supplementary Planning Document 'A Guide for Designing House Extensions & Alterations' (the SPD) states when considering the effects of rear extensions, the design should be reflective of the main building and respect important elevation features, while also advocating pitched roofs as being more appropriate, relating better to the host property.
9. The pitched roofs to the outriggers at the rear of these properties are an important characteristic shared by the houses on this side of the street. Whilst a two-storey flat-roofed extension has already been permitted adjacent to the outrigger, the bulk and form of the approved extension sat more discreetly back from the outrigger and was therefore a more subservient addition than that which has been built. The additional projection of the two-storey extension adds modest but nevertheless significant mass and bulk to the rear elevation of the property, while the use of a flat roof exacerbates its visual harm. As a result, it is incongruous with the prevailing style of the immediate area and harms the character of the host dwelling when viewed in context with the pitched gable roof to which it is joined, contrary to the SPD.
10. While I appreciate the building is not Listed or within a Conservation Area, it has its own character and, along with the rest of the houses in this street, contributes positively to the wider area in general. The lack of designation as a heritage asset does not negate this harm.
11. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) seeks development that will function well and add to the overall quality of the area while also being sympathetic to local character, including the built environment. The proposed two-storey element, with its additional mass and flat roof, is harmful to this character and would not add to the overall quality of the area, nor is it sympathetic to the local character. This is contrary to the advice given in the Framework, which makes clear that good design is an important contributor to sustainable development. The development is also contrary to the SPD and policy L7 of the Trafford Council Local Plan Core Strategy (CS), which seeks to ensure development is appropriate in its context and enhance the street scene or character of the area.

Living conditions

12. The two-storey element of the rear extension is located close to the common boundary with No.40 and projects 2.5m from the rear elevation. The separation distance to the boundary is noted as 15cm, which is not in dispute between the parties. The SPD advises two-storey rear extensions should not normally project more than 1.5m close to a shared boundary, but if the extension is set

away from the boundary by more than 15cm, this projection can be increased by an amount equal to the extra distance from the side boundary. Given there is no additional distance over 15cm, the advisable limit is 1.5m projection, which was allowed under application 93917/HHA/18.

13. The extension does not adhere to this guidance. Moreover, it has an overbearing impact upon the first-floor rear window of No.40, which is set back from the extension, causes a sense of enclosure and reduces outlook. Consequently, the proposal causes harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 40.
14. While I appreciate the cost implications of reversing the works undertaken, this has no bearing on the main issue. Any additional disturbance such works could cause to neighbouring occupiers would be relatively short-lived and would not outweigh the harm to living conditions I have identified in assessing the works as they stand, the effects of which would be much longer lasting. As such I afford this argument limited weight in the decision-making process.
15. Accordingly, I find the development contrary to the Framework, which seeks through paragraph 127 to ensure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. The development is also in conflict with the guidance contained within the SPD and policy L7 of the CS, which aims to ensure development does not prejudice the amenity of the future occupiers of the development and/or occupants of adjacent properties by reason of overbearing, overshadowing, overlooking or visual intrusion.

Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR