The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2020

by C Dillon BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/20/3245407
60, St Pauls Hill Road, Hyde SK14 2SW

- 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 Anthony Donald against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref 19/00922/FUL, dated 12 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2019.
- The development proposed is described as 'first floor side extension built onto existing single storey extension'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. It is noted that the appellant has presented an amended scheme. This is materially different to the refused plans and interested parties have not had an opportunity to comment upon it. So as not to prejudice these parties this appeal has been determined on the basis of the submitted drawings numbered 'AD001' and 'AD002' which were refused planning permission on 9 December 2019.

Main Issue

3. It is noted that in addition to the proposed first floor extension, the submitted plans include the enclosure of the front section of the existing side extension, erection of a lean to roof over, replacement of the remaining section of roof, insertion of a roof lantern and bi-folding doors to the rear. The Council has raised no objections to these components, nor to any other matters and, from the evidence before me, I have no reason to find otherwise.

4. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor extension on the character and appearance of the host building and street scene, with particular regard to design, scale, mass and any consequential terracing effect of the first floor side extension.

Reasons

5. The host building is located within a well-established residential housing estate, positioned within a row of two storey semi-detached and detached dwellings that generally share a common front building line. It is connected to

No 58, St Pauls Hill Road by their respective single storey side extensions, a relatively common characteristic of the estate.

6. The existing spacing between dwellings within the street scene avoids a cramped pattern of development. The apparent sense of space is a positive characteristic of this street scene and the erosion of this would be harmful.

7. The proposed extension by virtue of its positioning, form and mass would infill a significant amount of the visual gap that currently exists between the host property and No 58, at first floor level. Whilst there is a change in levels between the respective eaves and ridge heights of the host building and No 58, this does not sufficiently mitigate visually for the loss of the gap at first floor level. Neither does it secure sufficient visual differential between the host building, the proposed extension and No 58, at first floor level. Consequently, the proposal would be an overly dominant feature within the street scene.

8. Whilst a number of dwellings within the estate have been extended to the side, up to first floor level, variations in their design are evident. Whilst the principal elevations and ridge lines of some are recessed to varying degrees, others are not.

9. The proposed first floor extension will increase the overall scale of the host building. The design of the proposed extension itself is consistent with the design of the host dwelling and some extensions elsewhere on the estate. However, the absence of any recess of the front elevation and ridgeline means that the overall design would not be subservient to the host dwelling and would thereby appear unduly dominant.

10. In turn, the proposal would contribute to a 'terracing effect' even in the absence of No 58, ever extending in a similar manner. When viewed within its own specific context, immediately next to another dwelling, the apparent design consistency between the host building and the proposed extension is insufficient in this particular instance to achieve a satisfactory form of development which would override the harm identified.

11. The harm to the character and appearance of the street scene that has been identified is in conflict with Policy 1.3 and Policy H10 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan Written Statement Adopted Plan (November 2004). These policies seek to secure high quality designed developments which are sensitive to the character and appearance of the local area and relationships between buildings.

12. The Tameside Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (March 2010) is a material consideration which provides further design guidance to supplement these local plan policies. In RED1 it recognises the need to acknowledge existing character and appearance within a design. RED5 recognises the harm that extending in the manner proposed can have on the character and appearance of a street scene and specifically sets out a series of design principles for side extensions to avoid such harm. The proposal is in conflict with both RED1 and RED5.

13. Instances within the wider estate which fall within a very similar context to the appeal site clearly demonstrate the terracing effect which the SPD seeks to avoid and the cumulative impact this has on the character and appearance of a street scene. Other examples cited by the appellant as being similar to the

proposal are not comparable in terms of their specific context and juxtaposition with neighbouring properties and, besides, any similar development will in itself be harmful.

14. The harm identified and the conflict with the development plan and relevant supplementary guidance is not outweighed by the appellant's arguments.

15. I therefore find the proposed first floor extension would, with particular regard to design, scale and mass, give rise to a terracing effect which would result in unacceptable harm to the street scene contrary to the provisions of the development plan as a whole.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Dillon

INSPECTOR