



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 June 2020

by R Cooper BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/19/3238843
46 Oxford Road, Altrincham WA16 9AU

- 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 Robert Bacon against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 98155/HHA/19, dated 28 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a rear extension with a lean-to pitched roof in brickwork and slate roof finish to match existing. Slotted windows to be included on side wall and bi-fold door to be included to the rear of the existing and extended part. New roof to include roof windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on character and appearance with particular regard to the Downs Conservation Area; and the living conditions of adjacent occupiers with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site comprises of a two storey mid-terrace dwelling. It forms part of a Victorian terrace with basements that provide a slightly elevated position above the street. The site is located within the Downs Conservation Area (the CA).
4. The Downs Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document SPD5.5 Conservation Area Appraisal (2016) identifies the special interest of the area. The site is located with Character Zone B, which is the core area, close to the town centre, and has a compact urban grain, with Victorian buildings some in commercial use and others purpose built residential dwellings.
5. To the front the terrace houses have two storey bays, and multi-coloured brickwork providing a rhythm and uniformity. To the rear the properties have two storey outriggers that are evenly spaced and small private yard areas. These features contribute to the special interest of the CA.
6. The proposed extension would be located to the rear of the property, infilling the area to the side of the existing outrigger and boundary fence. Due to the

location of the extension it would not be in view from the street and would not affect any key features to the front elevation. Whilst the outriggers provide a rhythm to the rear of the terrace, due to the height of surrounding boundary treatments, this is mostly viewed at the first floor level from the rear entry and surrounding private yards and gardens.

7. The proposed extension would be single storey, project no further back than the existing outrigger, and the highest part of the roof would be below the first floor windows. Thus, the overall form of the terrace, and the rhythm of the outriggers would be maintained at the first floor level. In my view this would preserve the overall appearance and the integrity of the building.
8. The proposed facing brickwork and roofing materials would match the host dwelling and would be in keeping with the surrounding buildings. I have considered the Council's concerns with regards to the scale and appearance of the proposed roof lights, windows and bi-fold doors, however these would not be viewed from the street and would not affect the aesthetic value of the principal elevation. An appropriate condition would have ensured that suitable materials were secured.
9. Consequently, the proposal would not harm character and appearance and would preserve the CA. The development would accord with Policies L7 and R1 of the Trafford Local Plan Core Strategy (2012), Trafford Supplementary Planning Document 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions, and The Downs Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document SPD 5.5, insofar as they relate to character and appearance, and ensuring development preserves or enhances the CA. It is also consistent with paragraph 193 of the Framework.

Living Conditions

10. The adjoining property at No 48 has a habitable room window at the ground floor level, this is in close proximity to the boundary shared with the appeal property. During the site visit I was able to enter No 48 and could see that the window served a bedroom.
11. The two storey outrigger at the appeal property and at No 48, are positioned either side of the above window. The boundary fence is also in close proximity. Whilst these restrict the occupier's perspective to a degree, the window still provides a reasonable level of outlook.
12. The side wall of the proposed extension would be brought up to the shared boundary, and the eaves would be significantly higher than the height of the existing fence. This would further restrict and channel the outlook from No 48, causing an overbearing impact.
13. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the living conditions of occupiers of No 48. Therefore, it would conflict with Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan Core Strategy (2012), and the Trafford Supplementary Planning Document 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions insofar as they relate to ensuring living conditions of occupants of adjacent properties are not harmed.

Other matters

14. I have taken into account the concerns raised in relation to overlooking, privacy, noise and disturbance. Based on the evidence before me these

matters could be addressed by condition. However, this does not affect my findings on the main issues.

15. The Council are satisfied that the proposal would not result in significant additional loss of light, and I have found no good reason to conclude otherwise. This matter does not affect my findings above.

Conclusion

16. Although I have found no harm from the proposal on character and appearance or to the CA. I have found there would be harm to living conditions with regards to outlook. This is the prevailing consideration. Therefore, having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Cooper

INSPECTOR