



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2019

by J Hunter BA (Hons) Msc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/W/19/3238103

26 Northenden Road, Sale, Manchester M33 3BR

- 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 Index Investments against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 97990/FUL/19, dated 7 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is ground and first floor extension to existing shop unit (hairdressing) with erection of refuse enclosure and garden area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a single storey end of terrace retail unit on a corner plot within a town centre location. The existing unit is of unremarkable design with a raised parapet to the front elevation screening a monopitch roof which slopes away towards the two storey properties to the rear, off Stamford Place.
4. The existing retail units are set back from Northenden Road by around 9 metres and follow an established and strong building line. Similarly, the eastern elevation of the appeal property, which fronts onto Stamford Place is set back from the road by approximately 8 metres and follows the established building line albeit interrupted by various boundary treatments which separate public realm from the private gardens. Overall, there is a spacious and open character to this part of the busy town centre location with relatively clear unobstructed views along the key streets and in particular those relevant to the appeal site.
5. The proposal would see the construction of a two storey extension on the front portion of the eastern elevation of the appeal property. In addition, the roof of the existing retail unit would be altered to facilitate a second storey within the property thus increasing the height of the front section of the roof to match that of the existing parapet. At ground floor level, beyond the two storey side extension there would be alterations to the existing boundary treatment and external works to facilitate a refuse storage and garden area. I note that the

Council has not raised any specific concerns with the principle of the proposed garden and refuse area and I have no reason to disagree. However, I note the proposal to introduce several cycle racks adjacent to the eastern elevation of the extension, adjacent to the footpath. I concur with the Council's view that there does not appear to be sufficient space available to accommodate the amount of cycle storage proposed although I do accept the appellant's point that the number could be reduced accordingly.

6. The proposed two storey extension would project into what is currently an open corner with a relatively solid, cumbersome brick built structure creating a bulky and incongruous feature that would appear out of place in the context of the relatively light weight single storey glazed shop fronts. The roof alterations to the front portion of the existing retail unit would create a boxy flat roof that when viewed from the east would fail to harmonise with the surrounding roofscape.
7. Viewed from the south, along Stamford Place, the extension would be relatively well screened at ground floor level by the existing boundary treatments and established planting. However, it would project beyond the established building line and the overall scale and bulk of the proposal would appear discordant in the street scene. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would have a significantly detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area.
8. I acknowledge that the existing shop fronts in this part of the town centre are of unremarkable design however the spacious character created by the strong building lines and wide pavements add to the character of the area. The proposal would encroach into the open area and appear out of place. The appellant suggests that the proposal would introduce a "physical stop" however, I consider that this would unbalance the street scene when viewed in the context of the whole terrace because at the other end of the terrace there is a gap before the next series of buildings begins.
9. The appellant further submits that the height of the proposal would be no greater than the highest part of the existing roof and therefore it would be in keeping with the scale of the existing building. Whilst I appreciate that height would be no greater than the parapet along the front roof plain, the proposal would significantly increase the overall bulk and massing of the building which would appear out of place in the context of both the existing building and the wider street scene.
10. I accept that the appellant has designed the proposal to utilise materials that would match the existing buildings and that some of the contemporary design features would add interest in the wider street scene however, this does not outweigh my findings on the main issue. I consider that overall, the proposal would have an unacceptable detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the area and in this regard, it would conflict with the aims of policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy (CS) and paragraph 124 and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). These policies, amongst other things, are concerned with creating well-designed developments that are appropriate in their context and enhance and the character and quality of an area.

Conclusion

11. For the collective reasons above, and taking into account all other matters, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

J Hunter

INSPECTOR