
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2021

by D Hartley BA (Hons) MTP MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/W/21/3272919
452 Barton Road, Stretford M32 9RW

- 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 Dr Shela Ahmed against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 102230/HHA/20, dated 14 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a solar panel carport to front-drive and alterations to front boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The evidence is that when the planning application was submitted the carport had already been erected. However, I noticed on my site visit that it had been taken down and the various components of the structure were placed to the side of the driveway. I have not therefore determined the appeal on the basis of it being a retrospective proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property falls within a predominantly residential area and fronts Barton Road which is busy. This side of Barton Road includes double height bay fronted and hipped roofed brick built semi-detached dwellings which are set back from the main road. The properties are positioned in a linear form and most have open front gardens and driveways set behind low walls, the latter of which include relatively narrow entrance gates. In this regard, there is a uniformity to the pattern and design of development in this part of Barton Road adding positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The carport would include solar panels, have a mono pitch roof and would project from the ground floor until it almost met the front boundary. Owing to its position, scale and appearance it would appear incongruous and obtrusive in the street-scene detracting from both the semi-detached dwelling building line and the uniformity of open space to the front of the dwellings in this part of the

street. The structure would be viewed as a dominating and out of scale addition to the host property and semi-detached properties. The aforementioned harm would be compounded as a result of the recent removal of a significant length of boundary wall which would make the appeal structure even more noticeable in the street-scene.

6. For the above reasons, I find that significant harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the character, appearance and design requirements of policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy 2012, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations 2012, and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

7. I acknowledge that the development includes the use of solar panels and hence that there would be some positive environmental benefits associated with this part of the proposal. Furthermore, I accept that the proposal would enable more cars to be parked to the front of the house and that it would help to promote the use of electric vehicles. However, these benefits would be tempered to some extent by the fact that it is likely that it would be possible to install solar panels on the house itself and, in addition, the appeal structure need not be the only means of ensuring that electric vehicles are charged at the appeal site. In any event, the harm caused to the character and appearance of the area would be significant and this adverse environmental matter would not be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal.
8. The appellant has referred me to examples of front extensions elsewhere (e.g. Barlow Moor Road and Manchester Road), but the evidence is that these are not within the Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council administrative area. I do not know the circumstances which led to these developments being constructed, but the images shown indicate different site conditions. This is not therefore a matter which alters or outweighs my conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development would not accord with the development plan for the area taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

D Hartley

INSPECTOR