
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2020

by D Hartley BA (Hons) MTP MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/20/3254266
24 Mosley Road, Timperley WA15 7TF

- 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 Kevin Forbes against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 100179/HHA/20, dated 24 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling located within an established housing estate. In the immediate area there is a mix of semi-detached and detached brick built properties many of which have hipped roofs. Most of the properties have undeveloped landscaped gardens and driveways fronting Mosley Road and, in the main, there is a regularity and consistency of open space between properties at first floor level. These attributes add positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. There is no dispute between the parties that the proposed two storey rear extension would be acceptable from the point of view of its design and effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. Subject to the imposition of planning conditions, I have no reason to disagree with the Council's views about this part of the development.
5. The point of contention between the main parties relates to the two storey side extension. This would not accord with the Council's SPD 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations 2012 (SPD) in so far that the roof would not be stepped down from the existing main roofline of the dwelling and as its front elevation would not be stepped back from the existing front elevation. However, in this case there is justification for departing from this guidance in so far that the neighbouring semi-detached dwellinghouse has been extended in a similar manner. Consequently, and in this regard, I do not

consider that harm would be caused to the balance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties.

6. My main concern relates to the proximity of the two storey side extension to the boundary of the property and to No 22 Mosley Road. On this side of Mosley Road there are very distinct gaps / open spaces at first floor level (i.e. over the subservient side garages). The proposal would result in a two storey side extension in very close proximity to the side boundary of the property (about 0.7 of a metre) and hence would appear unacceptably cramped when viewed from the street-scene, detracting from the otherwise regularity and rhythm of open space between properties. In this regard, there would be conflict with the SPD which states that *'a gap of a minimum of 1.0 metre should be retained between the side elevation of an extended property and its side boundary, to retain the impression of space to the side of the dwelling. This is particularly important within a row of closely spaced detached or semi-detached houses'*.
7. The appellant contends that there would be very little difference between a side extension that is 0.7 of a metre and 1.0 metre from the boundary of the site. In numerical terms that may be the case. However, for the reasons outlined significant harm would be caused as a result of this part of the development. I do not consider that it would be reasonable to allow harmful development when the SPD supports development which would be less harmful in terms the resultant space between existing developments. Furthermore, I would add that the SPD guidance refers to a *'minimum'* 1.0 metre gap.
8. I therefore conclude that when the proposal is considered as a whole, significant harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would not accord with the design requirements of the SPD; policy L7 of the adopted Trafford Core Strategy 2012 or chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

D Hartley

INSPECTOR