



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2020 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/20/3258621

22 Minehead Avenue, Flixton M41 6FD

- 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 Gaffney against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 100380/HHA/20, dated 16 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is to demolish existing garage to side of dwelling, porch to front of dwelling and single storey pitched roof rear extension, and to build new porch, 2 storey side and 2 storey rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal relates to a semi-detached, hipped-roofed, two-storey dwelling located on the western side of Minehead Avenue, within a residential area. The dwelling is set back from the road and has a single storey garage to the side, which fills in the gap between the dwelling and its northern side boundary.
 5. The properties located on Minehead Avenue vary in terms of scale, design and materials. Some of them have been extended to the side; the scale and siting of their extensions also vary. Notwithstanding the existing side extensions, the remaining gaps between properties provide a degree of openness and prevent the buildings appearing cramped on their plots. Thus, the gaps between dwellings contribute positively to the character and appearance of the street scene.
 6. The proposal seeks to introduce a part two-storey, part single storey extension to the side/rear, a two-storey rear extension and a front porch. The main issue
-

relates to the two-storey side element; thus, I shall consider the appeal scheme based on the Council's reason for refusal.

7. The two-storey side extension would project along the full depth of the dwelling and would have a hipped roof which would be partly in line with the existing ridge line and then set down from the main ridge towards its northern side. The appeal dwelling is at an angle in relation to its northern side boundary. The side extension would vary in terms of width, as the angled northern side boundary dictates. Thus, the extension would have its widest point towards the front and only a small overall set-in from the side boundary.
8. Due to its height, width and depth, the two-storey side extension would add significant mass and bulk to the side of the host dwelling. Notwithstanding the siting of neighbouring property No 20 Minehead Avenue, which occupies a corner plot and is at an angle with No 22, due to the limited distance between the appeal property and its northern boundary, the increased massing of the dwelling would result in a development that appears cramped on its plot. Consequently, the development would harmfully affect the openness of the street scene.
9. The appellants have drawn my attention to the two-storey side extensions of neighbouring properties, which are not set in from their side boundaries. However, I do not have all the details of these extensions or the circumstances in which they were granted permission before me. In any event, I consider that these are not positive examples and do not justify the harmful impact that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the street scene.
10. I note that there has not been an objection from No 20. Whilst the proposal would not have a direct harmful impact on the adjacent property No 20, this is a neutral matter rather than one that carries weight in favour of the scheme.
11. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy (CS), which requires, amongst other things, that developments enhance the street scene or character of the area by appropriately addressing scale, height and massing.
12. The proposal would also be in conflict with the guidance outlined within the Supplementary Planning Document SPD 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions & Alterations (SPD) regarding the siting and massing of two-storey side extensions. Notwithstanding the status of the SPD, its guidance seeks to achieve, amongst other things, the objectives of Policy L7 of the CS, as set out above.

Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR