
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2019 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 January 2020

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/19/3237736\
196 Walton Road, Sale, M33 4FG**

- 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 Ms Jennifer Postlethwaite against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 98164/HHA/19, dated 28 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear and side wrap around extension. Hip to gable loft conversion with dormer on rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. It is suggested by the appellant that part of the proposal, the hip to gable roof extension, could be constructed as 'permitted development'. This is not a matter for me to determine in the context of a s78 appeal and accordingly I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans before me.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - (i) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area; and,
 - (ii) the living conditions of occupiers of No 198 Walton Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling, of similar character and appearance to other properties in the locality. This proposal is for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension and hip to gable roof extension with a dormer to the rear.

Character and appearance

5. Properties within this residential area are predominantly pairs of semi-detached dwellings with hipped roofs and this roof design is reflected in the appeal dwelling and the attached property. Whilst some properties have been

extended, the uniformity of house types and roof forms remains a key characteristic of the area.

6. The detailed guidance within the Trafford Council Supplementary Planning Document, SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations, 2012 (the SPD) recognises the importance of symmetry of semi-detached properties and notes that the roof design of extensions should match the main roof of the semi-detached pair.
7. The proposed hip to gable extension would introduce additional massing to the roof which would significantly alter its form and thus disrupt the distinctive symmetry with No 198. It would also be at odds with the predominant character and appearance of dwellings in the street. This unbalance to the pair of semi-detached dwellings and, as it would be readily apparent from public vantage points, would therefore read as an incongruous and harmful addition to the street scene.
8. The proposed rear dormer would have a flat roof design and would span much of the full width of the extended roof. It would be set in only marginally from the eaves and ridge. As such, it would be a box-like structure which would not reflect the form of the existing roof but rather would read as a top-heavy and overly dominant addition to the dwelling due to its scale, bulk and positioning.
9. Consequently, taking all the above into consideration, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene. It would therefore conflict with policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy, 2012 (the LP) which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure developments are appropriate in their context and enhance the street scene or character of the area by appropriately addressing scale, density, height, massing and elevation treatment. It would also be contrary to the requirements of the SPD as set out above.

Living conditions

10. The proposed single storey rear extension would project into the garden along the shared boundary with No 198, within close proximity to a ground floor window serving a habitable room of the attached dwelling. The SPD provides an indication of the appropriate limit for development along shared boundaries, beyond which an extension is likely to have an overbearing effect on neighbouring occupiers. This proposal would considerably exceed the recommended maximum projection of 3 metres and, when combined with its overall height, it is therefore likely to result in an uninviting outlook and create an oppressive living environment for occupiers of No 198.
11. The appellant has expressed the view that this proposal is less overbearing than a previously approved two storey side and rear extension to the host dwelling. Further, it is suggested that occupiers of No 198 prefer this proposal and have agreed to a new party wall. Be that as it may, I have not been provided with any further details of the previously approved scheme and cannot therefore make a comparison. Nevertheless, I have determined this appeal on its own merits and have found that it would harm outlook as noted above.
12. As such, this proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in terms of outlook. It would therefore conflict with

policy L7 of the LP which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure developments do not prejudice the amenity of occupants of adjacent properties by reason of overbearing and visual intrusion. It would also be contrary to the objectives of the SPD.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hannah Ellison

Appeal Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

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

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR