
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 June 2021

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/21/3270574
18 Hartford Road, Davyhulme M41 0RZ

- 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 Chris Walpole against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref 102321/HHA/20, dated 27 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension including single storey rear extension. Works to include a front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two storey side extension including single storey rear extension. Works to include a front porch at 18 Hartford Road, Davyhulme M41 0RZ in accordance with the terms of the application ref 102321/HHA/20 dated 27 September 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: WSD-M410RZ-E; WSD-M410RZ-P; WSD-M410RZ-S; WSD-M410RZ-SL; WSD-M410RZ-SP; WSD-M410RZ-DW
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary matters

2. The Council's reason for refusal relates to the first-floor side extension, the other works referred to in the banner heading above are not the focus of the Council's concerns. Following my site visit I see no reason to disagree and I have considered the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

3. Having regard to the above, the main issue is the effect of the first floor side extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Hartford Road is an attractive street where properties are similarly designed mostly semi-detached houses set back from the road frontage. Properties have

modest front gardens with sufficient space to the front of the dwellings to provide car parking. There are spaces between some dwellings but ground floor garage extensions up to side boundaries and some first-floor side extensions limit spaciousness between buildings and within the street scene.

5. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached house typical of the wider suburban neighbourhood. It is brick constructed with a hipped pitched roof and single storey hipped pitched roofed garage attached to the side which extends close to the side boundary.
6. The Supplementary Planning Document SPD4: A guide to designing house extensions and alterations (February 2012) (SPD) advises that extensions should be in keeping with the prevailing pattern of residential development and should not erode the amount of space surrounding the dwelling. A gap of a minimum of 1 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.
7. The Council is concerned that the first floor side extension would not provide a gap of 1 metre to the side boundary and that as a result the scale, height and massing of the first floor extension would appear cramped. However, the set back of the first-floor addition and its set down from the roof line and hipped roof design would minimise its appearance in the street scene and ensure that the extension would not create a significant terracing effect. Further, the set back of the first floor would ensure the rhythm of breaks between dwellings at first floor level would be retained and the development would not be unduly prominent or incongruous in the street scene.
8. Consequently, whilst the extension would not comply with every part of the SPD, in this case it would be appropriate to the character of the dwelling and the street, it would not appear cramped in its context and would not lead to unacceptable loss of spaciousness.
9. I noted the various extensions referred to by the parties at my site visit. Whilst the neighbourhood has a typical house design, road widths and plot sizes vary between streets. Therefore, I have determined this appeal having regard to the character of Hartford Road and for the reasons I have set out I consider that the proposal would not cause harm.
10. Overall, the proposed first floor side extension would accord with Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan Core Strategy January 2012 where in matters of design development must be appropriate in its context, take opportunities to improve the character and quality of the area and appropriately address, among other things, scale, density, height and massing. It would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition is necessary to ensure that the proposed development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in the interests of clarity. It is also necessary to attach a condition to make sure that the materials used match the existing property to ensure that the development has a satisfactory appearance.

12. The Council suggest a condition to ensure that the flat roof to the rear is not used as a balcony. However, the design of the roof with roof lanterns does not lend itself to balcony use and I do not consider such a condition to be necessary.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to the evidence before me, I conclude that the proposals would accord with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal is allowed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR