
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2019

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/19/3230653
352 Glebelands Road, Sale M33 5GQ

- 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 Neil Taylor against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 97061/HHA/19, dated 6 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension and single storey front extension and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene along Glebelands Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located in a well-established residential area. It is a two-storey semi-detached house, brick built with a hipped roof and part of a group of similar pairs on the north side of Glebelands Road. Like the neighbouring dwellings, the appeal property is modest in size, but the broad street with its grass verge, mature street trees and garden planting combine to give this section of Glebelands Road a verdant, spacious and pleasant character. The gaps between the pairs of houses on this part of the street are for the most part not especially wide, but nevertheless make a positive contribution to the area's character by helping to establish the rhythm of the built form, as well as by allowing glimpses through to trees in rear gardens.
4. The 2012 Trafford Supplementary Planning Document 'A guide for Designing House Extensions & Alterations' (the SPD) advises that for two storey side extensions or first floor additions "a gap of a minimum of 1 m should be retained between the side elevation of an extended property and its side boundary", so as to ensure that extensions do not erode the sense of spaciousness within an area.
5. The proposal is to add a two storey side extension which would also project forward of the existing front building line on the ground floor. This would leave a gap of only around 0.6 m between the appeal property and the boundary with No 354. I acknowledge that the SPD is guidance, but the objective of

ensuring that adequate space remains around an extended property so that development does not appear cramped is consistent with the principles of good design contained within Policy 7 of the 2012 Trafford Core Strategy. In this case, the proximity of the side extension to the boundary would reduce the sense of spaciousness which is characteristic of the area. This would be emphasised because of the way the appeal property's front building line sits forward of the neighbouring pair of Nos 354 and 356.

6. The SPD advises that front extensions may be acceptable if they reflect the design, materials and proposition of the original house. The front extension in this case would project forward by around 0.5 m to match the depth of the existing bay, would retain the arched porch, and would not significantly erode the garden space at the front of the property. It would also be of materials and design which would complement the host property. I consider that, taken on its own, this element of the proposed development complies with the SPD guidance and would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the original property and street scene. However, it could not be separated from the other parts of the proposal, and this lack of harm would not outweigh the detrimental effect of the side extension on the area's spacious character.
7. On balance therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would, by virtue of the side extension's proximity to the boundary with No 354, result in a development which would appear cramped and which would have a significant adverse effect on the spacious character and appearance of the Glebelands Road street scene. This would conflict with Policy L7 of the Core Strategy and guidance contained within the SPD, which seek to ensure that development is designed in a way which appropriately addresses the massing and layout of its area. For the same reasons, the proposal would conflict with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to encourage good design.

Other matters

8. The appellant has referred to other properties nearby which have been developed in ways which do not comply with the Council's guidance. No details have been provided, but in any case this would not in itself be a reason to allow unacceptable development. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and find that it would cause harm as described above.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other relevant matters raised I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole, and the appeal should be dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector