
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2020 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/19/3238491

21 Winchester Avenue, Ashton-under-Lyne, OL6 8BU

- 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 Danny Cheetham against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00520/FUL, dated 12 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension to front of property.
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 21 Winchester Avenue and the local area.

Reasons

4. Winchester Avenue lies within an established residential street characterised by mainly detached dwellings set back from the highway with open frontages and low boundary treatments. Houses in this part of the street are characterised by large forward facing gables at first floor level, with additional first floor accommodation set back. While several of the dwellings in the local area have been extended, mainly through the conversion of the garage to living accommodation, the uniformity and rhythm in the design of the buildings at first floor level, remains largely intact. It is this uniformity that gives the area its prevailing character, particularly in the dwellings in close proximity to the appeal site.
5. The host dwelling is a detached property with a gabled roof, with part of the first floor set back, and as such makes a positive contribution to the prevailing character of the area. The integral garage has previously been converted to living accommodation.

6. The Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (2010) (SPD) includes several policies relevant to this proposal. Policy RED1 requires that extensions should be subordinate to the original dwelling and RED5 states that side extensions should be set back particularly at upper floor level to reduce terracing and to ensure that the existing scale and mass of the original building is retained. Policy RED9 goes on to say that, except for certain exceptions, front extensions would rarely be considered acceptable. The exceptions include front porches and appropriately proportioned extensions that do not dominate the building or do not detract from the existing street scene.
7. This proposal does not meet those exceptions as due to its massing and scale it would dominate the host dwelling and detract from the street scene and character. It would result in a double gabled frontage which would not be set back from the original dwelling, in fact it would protrude forward of the existing gable and be prominent in the street scene. The introduction of the second gable would detract from the simple form of the dwelling and create a cluttered frontage which would harm the character of the area by detracting from the uniformity displayed in the adjoining properties.
8. The appellant has included examples of other dwellings that have been extended in the local area although there is no indication of the location of these dwellings or whether they were constructed since the adoption of the SPD. However, from the photographs submitted, and from observations on the site visit, it would appear that none of the examples are directly comparable to the appeal proposal. Notwithstanding this, I have determined this appeal on the site specific circumstances of this case.
9. For the reasons above the extension would harm the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the local area, and would conflict with Policy H10-Detailed Design of Housing Developments of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan (2004), Policies RED1, RED5 and RED9 of the Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (2010) and para 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which together seek to ensure that development are of high quality and are sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. 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