



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 18 May 2021

by Mark Caine BSc (Hons) MTPL MRTPI LSRA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/21/3270263

13 Stocks Gardens, Stalybridge, Tameside SK15 2RD

- 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 Mrs Jag Cunliffe against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01047/FUL, dated 16 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side and front extension with elevational changes to the front, and a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side and front extension with elevational changes to the front, and a single storey rear extension at 13 Stocks Gardens, Stalybridge SK15 2RD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01047/FUL, dated 16 October 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: Location Plan 1/1250, Existing GA Site Plan & Elevations (01)001 Revision PL0, Existing & Proposed GA Floor Plans, Drawing No (02)001 Revision PL0 and Proposed GA Site Plan & Elevations, Drawing number (03)001 Revision PL0.
 - 3) No development shall commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved samples.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property consists of a two storey detached dwelling with single storey elements that include an attached side garage and an adjoining front projection that spans the entire front face of the house.
4. Stocks Gardens is characterised by detached dwellings of various styles and sizes that are laid out in a roughly linear pattern. A number of dwellings along the street have been altered and extended to the front in some way.

5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document entitled 'Residential Design' 2010 (SPD) provides guidance on household extensions. Policy RED 1 of the SPD requires extensions to acknowledge the character of the house and wider area. Policy RED 5 sets out more detailed guidance for side extensions, including that they should be designed with a minimum setback of 0.5m from the main façade. Amongst other things, Policy RED 9 advises that front extensions should not disrupt the existing building line, should align with the architectural style of the existing building and its surroundings and is appropriately proportioned as to not dominate the building's façade.
6. The Council has raised no objections to the proposed single storey rear extension, and I have no substantive reason to disagree with this view.
7. The proposed first floor side and front extension element of the proposal would not be set back from the main façade of the existing building. Instead it would be built above the existing single storey side garage and relatively narrow existing front ground floor projection. As a result, there would be no increase in footprint. The ridge line of the projecting first floor front gable would also be set below that of the main roof. Despite its width, I therefore consider that the additional bulk and mass of this element of the proposal would be relatively modest.
8. Although the proposed first floor front extension would alter the existing frontage of the host dwelling it would be of a similar size and scale as some of the other two storey front extensions that are located in the immediate area and benefit from planning permission. These include the neighbouring properties at 16 and 18 Stocks Gardens, which are situated on the opposite side of the road. In my view, these do not appear as unbalanced or overpowering when seen against the larger scale main dwellings.
9. The Council argues that these extensions were granted permission under the provisions of the previous development plan and prior to the adoption of the SPD. Nonetheless, there is no evidence before me of how previous planning policies and supplementary guidance differs from those contained in the current development plan and SPD in respect of assessing residential extensions. In any case, these now form a part of the established character and appearance of the immediate surroundings.
10. Furthermore, although the properties on the same side of the road as the appeal site are laid out in a roughly linear manner, there is not a regimented building line. On my site visit I saw that the appeal dwelling already sits proud of the frontages of all of these neighbouring properties. As a result, I do not consider that the modest proposed first floor projection, in combination with its width and the aluminium cladding would appear overly dominant or unduly conspicuous in the street scene.
11. I therefore find the size, scale, siting and design of the proposal to be such that it would appear as a subordinate addition to the main building and would not be incongruous in its context. As such the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore not conflict with Policies 1.3, C1 and H10 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan Written Statement 2004 (UDP). Amongst other matters these seek to secure high quality design that complements or enhances the character and appearance of the surrounding

area. It would also accord with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

12. Whilst I acknowledge that the proposal does conflict with some of the specific design advice contained within the Council's SPD, this is to be applied with discretion. Given the particular circumstances of this case, I am satisfied that the overall aims of this guidance would not be undermined.

Conditions

13. I have considered the planning conditions suggested by the Council. In addition to the statutory time limit condition, I agree that a condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary to provide certainty. However, as the proposal would incorporate a panel of aluminium cladding the standard condition requiring for the use of matching materials is not reasonable or necessary. As I do not have the full details of the aluminium cladding before me I have replaced this suggested condition with a condition to ensure that samples of the materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension are submitted for the local planning authority's approval. This is in the interests of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, having taken account of the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Mark Caine

INSPECTOR