



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/21/3281325

The Coppice, 6 Lindisfarne Close, Sale M33 3RB

- 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 Walsh against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 103720/HHA/21, dated 2 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is Extension and conversion of existing garage to form self-contained annexe.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposal would appear as a subordinate residential annexe with particular emphasis on the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The host dwelling is a detached two-storey dwelling with an existing outbuilding and is located at the end of a cul-de-sac in a predominately residential area. It is rendered externally. The appeal proposal seeks to convert and extend the existing outbuilding, adding an additional storey, which would raise the roof height by approximately 1.7m and would facilitate a self-contained living annexe.
4. The proposed self-contained annexe has its own bathroom and kitchen/living/dining area and would not be interdependent with any of the facilities provided in the main house at No.6. The proposed annexe could also be used completely independently of the main house. The proposal would not appear or function as a subordinate residential annexe and would appear to have a very limited functional connection with the main house at No.6, which would be limited to the potential use of the remaining garden.
5. I have found that the proposal would appear as a small, detached house, constructed adjacent the existing dwelling, looking onto the parking area, rather than being subordinate to No.6. Further, the proposed fenestration, external finishes and roof profile contrast with No.6 and with the street frontage of properties in the local area, which demonstrate the design and appearance principles of the cul-de-sac plots.

6. However, although there is not a proposal for a separate dwelling before me, for the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would not appear or function as a subordinate residential annexe. Therefore, I am not satisfied that the application of a suitable condition requiring the proposed annexe to be used for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling would be in line with Paragraph 55 and 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), in that it would not be relevant to the form or function of the development proposed and would not result in an otherwise unacceptable development being acceptable.
7. For these reasons, the proposal would be discordant with the host dwelling, incongruous within the context of the street scene of Lindisfarne Close and have an undue prominence that would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area. This would be contrary to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy (2012) and Paragraph 130 of the Framework, which collectively seek to ensure that such development is of high-quality design, adds to the overall quality of the area, respects the appearance and character of the local area and fits unobtrusively within its context.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR