



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 June 2020 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/20/3248457
20 Wood Road, Timperley WA15 6AW

- 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 Andrii Lutai against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 99494/HHA/19, dated 4 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2020.
 - The development proposed, as described on the application form, is a two-storey pitched roof side extension and single storey pitched roof rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single, part two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, single storey front extension incorporating front porch and external alterations at 20 Wood Road, Timperley WA15 6AW, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 99494/HHA/19, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 242-01, 242-06, 242-07, 242-08A, 242-09A, 242-10A.

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.

Procedural Matter

3. Notwithstanding the description of the development which is taken from the application form, a more precise description of the proposal is that provided in the decision notice, and which the appellant has confirmed in the appeal form, as 'erection of a part single, part two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, single storey front extension incorporating front porch and external alterations'. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers at No 167 Woodhouse Lane East, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located within a residential area. The appeal site is wedge shaped which narrows in width from the front to the rear.
6. Due to the shape of the appeal site, the proposed two storey side extension would be positioned close to the shared boundary with No 167 Woodhouse Lane East and its rear garden. It would also be within close proximity to a first-floor window on the south east elevation of No 167. I have considered the Council's concern regarding the effect of the extension on the outlook from both the window and rear garden area.
7. Section 2.17 of the Supplementary Planning Document, SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (February 2012) (the SPD) notes that windows and gardens of neighbouring properties will be protected from undue overbearing, and sets out the factors to be taken into account when assessing a potential overbearing impact, including the position of the extension, presence of habitable room windows in neighbouring rooms and the size of the garden.
8. The first-floor habitable room window of concern on the south east elevation of No 167 would not directly face the side gable of the proposed extension. Whilst an existing extension at No 167 is within close proximity to the window, the proposed extension to the appeal site would be set-off a sufficient distance so as not to result in a tunnelling effect. Thus, this proposal would not interfere with the outlook from the window and would not therefore result in an uncomfortable sense of enclosure for neighbouring occupiers.
9. From the evidence before me it is clear that due to No 167's corner location the rear section of garden is of limited size, whereas the larger, main garden area is located to the side of the dwelling. I also acknowledge that there are limited rear facing windows at No 167. It therefore seems to me that the most useable external space at No 167 is predominantly located beyond its side elevation. Whilst I do not doubt that the expanse of brickwork on the gable end of the proposed extension would be visible from within the rear garden, due to the arrangement of the external space, the proposal would not be so overbearing so as to result in significant visual intrusion or a harmful sense of enclosure for neighbouring occupiers.
10. Consequently, the proposed development would not result in a harmful effect on the living conditions of occupiers at No 167 Woodhouse Lane East and it is therefore consistent with Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy (January 2012) which seeks to ensure developments do not prejudice the amenity of the occupants of adjacent properties by reason of overbearing or visual intrusion. It would also accord with the guidance of the SPD as set out above.

Other Matter

11. A neighbouring occupier is concerned that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character of the dwelling and wider area. The Council has raised no objection in this regard. Whilst the host dwelling is of similar character and appearance to the attached property and the predominant dwelling type in the wider area, it is read in context with the short

stretch of six properties along Wood Road, which include detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying style. Therefore, based on all I have seen and read I have no reason to disagree with the Council's assessment in this regard.

Conditions

12. Other than the standard time limit and approved plans conditions, the Council has suggested a condition requiring the external materials to be used in the construction of the development to match those of the existing building. This has also been suggested by a third party. However, I have had regard to the proposed development which includes external alterations to the host dwelling, including the use of render. The proposed materials are identified on the submitted plans and I note the Council has not raised any concerns with this part of the development. Consequently, a condition restricting the materials to match the existing building would be unnecessary.
13. I do not consider a condition that restricts the days and times of construction, as requested by a third party, to be necessary given the limited scale of the proposed development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Hannah Ellison

Appeal Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR