



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2020

**by A Parkin BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 11 August 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/20/3253153**  
**5 Thurlestone Drive, Davyhulme M41 7AG**

- 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 & Mrs K Henshaw against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 99869/HHA/20, dated 26 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2020.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a first storey side and rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first storey side and rear extension at 5 Thurlestone Drive, Davyhulme M41 7AG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 99869/HHA/20, dated 26 January 2020, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Proposed Site Plan DWG: 00; Proposed Plans DWG: 01;  
Proposed Elevations DWG: 02; Proposed Elevations DWG: 03; and,  
Location Plan.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a residential area containing traditional, semi-detached, garden-fronted dwellings. Many of the dwellings have been altered, such as by rendering the front elevation, the provision of porches or by various side extensions. The front boundary treatments of the dwellings are similarly mixed, and include hedges, fences and walls. There are trees of varying sizes within the footpaths and the area has a pleasant, suburban character.
4. The appeal building is the western of a pair of hip-roofed, semi-detached dwellings, which have a common rendered front elevation. It faces in a northwesterly direction across Thurlestone Drive and as a result of its position

and corner location, has a large front and side garden area, which is somewhat unusual.

5. A single-storey, hip-roofed, brick extension has been constructed on the southwestern side of the appeal dwelling, within the garden area. It is set back from the main front elevation and extends a short distance to the rear, with a reasonable amount of garden space remaining to both its front and side. The position and orientation of the host building within the plot means that the side extension is somewhat closer to the highway.
6. The semi-detached dwellings including the appeal dwelling are not a particularly 'balanced' pair of properties, even when seen from directly in front. They have different window and doorway canopy designs; different rooftiles; significantly different front garden boundary treatments; and, the existing side extension to the appeal dwelling is unmatched at No 3.
7. The proposed development would entail the construction of an additional storey above the existing extension, of a similar design and materials. It would extend over the small recessed area to the rear, where it would be supported by a brick pillar, but would generally follow the footprint of the existing extension.
8. Whilst nearer to the highway than the host building, the proposed extension would not project forward from the established front building line of the dwellings to the south. In views from the south and east the proposed extension would be largely screened by the neighbouring buildings and the host building; where visible it would generally be seen in close context to the host building or No 7, next door.
9. It would be most noticeable in views from the front and the west side and would have a manifestly greater visual impact than the existing extension. However, the sympathetic design, including a common eaves level and a pitched roof that is lower in height than the main roof ridgeline, would still be in proportion to the host building and would not be out of keeping with the wider streetscene.
10. Similarly, the proposed brick finish would match the existing extension and the side elevation of the host building. The contrast between the brick and the front render of the host building would match the arrangement with the existing extension and is not uncommon in the area, or visually harmful.
11. The proposed extension would also be set back from the front of the host dwelling, with garden to the front and side that provides a clear separation from the highway and No 7. This means that it would not be an unduly prominent feature in the streetscene, despite its height and massing.
12. I do not share the Council's concern that the largely blank side elevation of the extension would be overbearing, largely due to its setback position and orientation to the street. In addition, the side elevation would generally be seen in the context of the front or rear elevations of the extension, and with other nearby dwellings and associated structures, such as boundary hedges or fences, or nearby trees on the footpath.

13. The Council makes reference to general guidance contained in its adopted Supplementary Planning Document 4<sup>1</sup>, specifically paragraphs 2.2.1 and 2.3.1. I find no conflict between these paragraphs and the appeal proposal, and I note that the Council's Officer report makes no direct reference to the detailed guidance for Side Extensions (Section 3.1) or Corner Properties (Section 3.3) contained in SPD4.
14. For these reasons the proposed extension would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. It would not, therefore, conflict with Policy L7 (Design) of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy, January 2012, with SPD4, or with the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

### **Conditions and Conclusion**

15. The Council has suggested a number of conditions be attached to any grant of planning permission, should the appeal be allowed, which I have considered in light of Government guidance and amended accordingly.
16. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition specifying the approved drawings would be necessary for reasons of certainty, and to protect the character and appearance of the area.
17. A condition requiring the external materials to be used in the development to match those used in the existing building would be neither precise nor necessary, given the different materials to be found on the existing building and the annotation on the approved drawings.
18. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

*Andrew Parkin*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> A guide for designing house extensions and alterations, February 2012 (SPD4)