



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2022

by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/21/3289779

21 Hawthorn Avenue, Timperley, WA15 6TS

- 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 and Mrs Daniel Robinson against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 105515/HHA/21, dated 26 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is a part single storey front extension to garage, part first floor front extension to form additional bedroom to existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single storey front extension to garage and part first floor front extension at 21 Hawthorn Avenue, Timperley, WA15 6TS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 105515/HHA/21, dated 26 July 2021, 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 Block Plan drawing no. 201503/OS1; Existing Survey drawing no. 201503/Es1A; and Scheme Proposals drawing no. 201503/SkG2.
 - 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.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council raised no objections to the proposed ground floor extensions and the appellant has indicated that these parts of the proposal were subject to a separate application¹ that was approved in October 2021. From the evidence before me and what I saw on my site visit, I see no reason to come to a different conclusion with regard to this part of the proposal. Therefore, in determining the appeal my focus has been the matter in dispute between the parties, namely the first floor front extension.
3. The description of development in the banner heading is taken from the application form. However, the fact that the extension is to provide an

¹ Application Reference 105514/HHA/21

additional bedroom at the existing dwelling is superfluous as it is not an act of development. Therefore, I have not included it in my formal decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached Victorian house with a projecting front gable feature that has decorative wooden barge boards. The house has previously been extended at both the side and the rear. There is another pair of similar houses to the side of No 23, otherwise housing on the road is mixed with detached, semi-detached and terraced housing being evident. These vary significantly in terms of age, design and materials, giving the area a mixed character.
6. Detailed advice on house extensions is provided in *SPD 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (adopted February 2012)*. This indicates that front extensions should be modest in scale, predominantly single storey and should not project excessively forward so that they do not detract from the design of the house or character of the street.
7. The proposed first floor extension would be located above the entrance porch and hall, adjacent to the projecting front gable. It would be modest in size and would not project quite as far as the front elevation of the gable. As such, it would fill a "corner" on the front elevation and would not project beyond the building line of the existing house. Given this, it would not be an overly prominent feature on the house or in the street scene.
8. Moreover, as the attached house has an extension in a similar position, the proposal would not appear an incongruous addition to the house or "unbalance" the pair of houses. The set back of the first floor element of the side extension, means the property would retain a staggered front elevation. This together with the space to the front of the house, means the plot would not appear over developed.
9. The incorporation of the distinctive decorative barge boards into the design of the proposal, together with the use of matching materials would ensure the proposal would respect the character of the host property and would be a sympathetic addition to it.
10. Consequently, I consider that the proposed extensions would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. Therefore, it would accord with Policy L7 of the *Trafford Core Strategy (adopted January 2012)* which, amongst other things, requires development to enhance the character of the area by appropriately addressing issues including scale, height, massing, elevational treatment and boundary treatments. Nor would it conflict with the *National Planning Policy Framework* which requires that developments are sympathetic to the local character.

Conclusion and Conditions

11. For the reasons set out above I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

12. In addition to the standard implementation condition, to provide certainty it is necessary to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to control the external appearance of the extensions.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR