



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/21/3279515

52 Craven Road, Altrincham WA14 5JD

- 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 Murphy against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 104058/HHA/21, dated 30 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension & single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the area and street scene.

Reasons

3. The Council's refusal reason is specific to the two-storey side extension only. The Council's delegated report specifically states that the proposed single storey rear extension is acceptable in relation to depth, width, height and overall scale. I have no evidence before me to conclude differently. In that regard, this appeal will focus on the main issue with specific regard to the two-storey side extension.
4. The host dwelling is one of a pair of semi-detached properties on a corner plot, of traditional design and proportions, located in a predominately residential area. An existing garage will be removed to facilitate the appeal proposal.
5. The proposed two-storey side extension would overwhelm the original dwelling, given the width of the projection, and lack of setback and would totally alter its character and appearance, especially when seen in the context of the splay to keep the extension away from the boundary. As such, I find that the proposal fails to respect the proportions of the main house.
6. The introduction of built form at first floor level in this location would add substantial mass to the dwelling. That massing would be at the same building line as the front extension, without a setback, and as such the apparent bulk of the building would be substantially increased. While a gap would remain between the proposed extension and the side elevation of No 50, due to the splay, the spaciousness around the appeal property would be eroded and as such the appeal property would appear cramped in its plot. Consequently, the

proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene. The use of matching materials as proposed would not mitigate this harmful effect.

7. The proposal, from the street scene would present, due to bulk, scale and massing as good as an additional dwelling on the end of the pair of semi-detached properties. As a result of this I find the proposal would be harmful to the appearance of the host dwelling due to it being a disproportionate addition.
8. Taking into account the impact to the host dwelling itself I find the proposal's impact is exacerbated by its location within the street scene in that it is on a prominent corner plot. The appeal site is currently occupied by a single storey garage which allows the corner to feel open, promoting views through the site.
9. Such locations are generally more sensitive to development because they are relatively exposed, visually, within the wider area. Two storey development as proposed would negatively impact upon the street scene by bringing additional two storey development to the existing building line. Overall, proposing development, at two storeys, I find would result in the proposal appearing visually dominant within the street scene which would be harmful to the character of the area.
10. As a result, I find the proposals are in conflict with Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy (2012), which, amongst other matters, expects development to be appropriate in its context and enhance the street scene or character of the area by appropriately addressing things such as scale, massing and layout.
11. The proposal would also be contrary to Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has provided examples of other extensions within their submission, but I have no details before me as to the consents which granted the developments highlighted. Notwithstanding this, even if I had accepted the proposal as acceptable in terms of impact upon the host dwelling itself, I still find the impact upon the character of the area would remain. The appeal site's location, by comparison to those sites which have been highlighted, is much more visually prominent and each case must be assessed upon its own merits.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR