
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020

by M Madge Dip TP, MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/20/3245409
60 Lostock Road, Davyhulme M41 0SY

- 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 Paul Massey against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 98344/HHA/19, dated 19 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is removal of existing garage and single storey rear extension. Erection of new two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council suggested that an access required site visit could be necessary. Given the main issue however, I found there was no need to enter the property and have seen everything I needed to from the surrounding public land.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Development along this part of Lostock Road is primarily of a residential nature. Detached and semi-detached properties are set back from both sides of the road behind wide tree lined verges. While this provides an open and spacious appearance to the wider area, there are only relatively small gaps between buildings. Many of the semi-detached dwellings, including the appeal site, have single storey garages at ground floor level, which almost touch their respective side boundaries.
5. The existing single storey garage visually fills the gap between the dwelling and the side boundary with 62 Lostock Road, which has a similar garage arrangement. The only discernible separation between these 2 dwellings is provided by the gap above the garages.
6. The extension as proposed would be set back from the front elevation and set down from the existing roof line. However, the first floor element would occupy a significant proportion of the gap between the host dwelling and No 62.

7. Supplementary Planning Document 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations adopted February 2012 (the SPD) advocates that 2 storey side extensions be set a minimum distance of 1 metre from the property's side boundary. That separation distance would not be achieved by the proposal.
8. I appreciate that this is only guidance, but it has been adopted as supporting guidance to the local plan policies and serves a useful planning purpose. The first floor gaps between the pairs of semi-detached dwellings provide a sense of space between properties and break up the built mass of the buildings. They also allow glimpses of mature trees and greenery behind the frontage buildings. The block within which the host dwelling sits retains most of these original gaps.
9. The proposal would result in a significant reduction of the gap between the host property and No 62. This would reduce the spaciousness between dwellings and unbalance the built mass of the block, which would lead to material harm to the established open and spacious character and appearance of the area.
10. The appellant has identified other extensions in the area, a need for the proposal to accommodate their growing family and suggests that revising the scheme would compromise the proposed extensions and lead to increased waste. I noted there are some properties with first floor extensions in the area, and some extend to the boundary. However, I note that the Council suggest these predate the adoption of the development plan and SPD and I consider that they show how such development does lead to a loss of the spacious character.
11. Turning to the appellant's personal need for the extension, the existing dwelling has stood for a considerable period and will be occupied for many more years. Allowing the extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area long after the personal requirements have ceased. Furthermore, while I note the suggestion that the scheme would be compromised by an alternative layout, there are no alternative plans before me, and in any case, the needs of the appellant would not outweigh the identified harm in this instance.
12. For the reasons identified, significant harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding area. Therefore, the proposal would not accord with Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy adopted January 2012 and the SPD, which seek to promote high quality design that enhances the street scene and character of the wider area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above the appeal is dismissed.

M Madge

INSPECTOR