



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by R Morgan MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/19/3234502

13 Southgate, Flixton, Manchester M41 9FS

- 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 Taker against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 97071/HHA/19, dated 5 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is the 'erection of single storey rear extension and first floor side extension above the existing garage'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the description of development on the Council's decision notice (and the appellants appeal form) which accurately and succinctly describes the proposal, rather than the longer description on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached red brick two-storey house located on the corner of Southgate and Westgate. Southgate is a relatively wide, tree lined residential street, with the houses set back from the road behind front gardens. These features contribute to the attractiveness of the area and provide a feeling of spaciousness. Whilst Westgate is a narrower side street it exhibits similar characteristics.
5. The appeal property itself has relatively modest sized gardens to the front and rear, with a high red brick wall along the boundary with Westgate. There are existing single storey side extensions on both sides of the property. On the Westgate side of the property is an attached single storey garage which is set back from the front of the house and has a relatively steep pitched hipped roof.
6. The plot of No 13 widens gradually from the front to the rear and the house and garage are angled slightly from the boundary with Westgate. At its closest point, the garage is approximately 1.5 metres from the boundary, widening to around 2.5 metres towards the rear. The siting of the garage is closer to the

street than the front building line of the properties on Westgate. Despite this, the impact of the garage when viewed from Westgate is limited due to its single storey height and hipped roof which slopes away from the boundary. Furthermore, the grey tiled roof provides contrast with the red brick walls of the house and boundary, softening the impact of the built development when viewed from the street.

7. The proposed development would add a first-floor element above the existing garage, broadly using the same footprint but set slightly further back from the main front elevation of the house, giving an overall set back of approximately 1.2 metres.
8. Whilst the proposed extension would not come any closer to the boundary with Westgate than the existing garage, the impact of the proposed first floor would be much more significant than the single storey garage, and would present a large, featureless red brick wall for the full height of the house along the Westgate frontage. Due to the proximity of the building to the boundary, this would appear overbearing and dominant from the street, resulting in harm to the character of the area.
9. Turning to the width of the side extension, the proposed first floor would result in a two-storey side projection which would be more than half the width of the original dwelling. However, when viewed from Southgate, the proposed two storey extension would be set back from the front elevation and the roof would be at a lower height than the main ridge. In my view, the extension would still appear as a subservient addition to the host property and would not harm the overall character of the host dwelling, or the area in general.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to other examples of extensions in the locality, including properties in corner locations¹. However, from the limited evidence before me, they are all materially different from the appeal proposal and in their impact on the wider area. Moreover, each case must be considered on its individual merits.
11. The proposal also includes a single storey flat roofed addition to the rear, which would link to both the two-storey extension and an existing single storey side/rear extension. This would further add to the overall built up footprint of the house and would be visible from the rear. However, the height of this part of the extension would be limited and its projection from the rear of the house relatively modest. To my mind, the single storey rear extension would not therefore cause harm to the character of the area.
12. For the above reasons, the development would harm to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan – Core Strategy 2012 as it relates to design, and detailed guidance contained in the Trafford LDF SPD4 – A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations 2012, in particular the need to respect the street scene (section 2.7) and guidance on extensions to corner properties (section 3.3). It would also conflict with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

¹ Properties on corner plots with extensions - 36 Lostock Road, 47 Lostock Road, 1 Avondale Crescent, 1 Cornhill Avenue, 22 Kingston Drive, 2 Riverside Drive and 11 Southgate

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, including the letters of support, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR