



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: 21st February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/21/3289648

52 St. Georges Crescent, Timperley, WA15 6HG

- 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 Craig Seery against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 104087/HHA/21, dated 28 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension to side and rear along with single storey extension to rear and porch extension to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has raised concerns with the Council's handling of the case and in particular that having amended the scheme they were advised it would be recommended for approval but then new issues were raised and it was refused. These are matters that would need to be taken up with the Council in the first instance and in determining the appeal I have only had regard to the planning merits of the case.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in the appeal are the effect of the proposed extension on:
 - The character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area; and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of No 1 Arderne Road with particular regard to outlook and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached house located in a residential area that predominantly comprises similar properties. The house is located on a curve in the road and as a result its plot is wider at the rear than at the front. As the dwelling is situated at the head of a T-junction it is prominent in views along St Georges Avenue.
5. The appeal scheme would include both single storey extensions at the front and rear and two storey side and rear extensions. The side extension would have a

stepped design that gets wider towards the rear of the house. This results in the proposal having a complex roof structure that would comprise a mixture of hipped, flat, single and dual pitched roofs. These various different elements would be readily visible in the street scene. As a result, the proposal would lack coherence and would not be a sympathetic addition to the dwelling or the surrounding area, which like the host property predominantly consists of simple hipped roofs.

6. Whilst other houses in the area have been extended, I observed that the designs of their roofs generally respected that of the host property in a way that the appeal scheme would not. Even if some of them do have quite complex roofs, unlike the appeal scheme the complexity is not visible in the street scene.
7. The ridge height of the extension would be lower than the roof on the original dwelling. Nonetheless, the wide single storey front extension that projects slightly further forward than the bay window on the house, and the minimal set back of the first floor from the main front elevation of the house, means the proposal would not appear a subservient addition to the dwelling. Together with the complexity of the roof structure, this means that the extension would dominate the appeal property and detract from the character of the host property.
8. Consequently, I consider the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policy L7 of the *Trafford Core Strategy (adopted January 2012)* (TCS) 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. It would also conflict with the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) which also requires that developments are sympathetic to the local character.

Living Conditions

9. To the rear of the property, No 1 Arderne Road has a very small rear garden. As a result, the distance between this house and those on St Georges Crescent is limited. The distance the proposed extension would be to the rear boundary with this house varies but at its closest it would only be around 6m from it. However, this adjacent house does not directly face No 52 but is at an angle to it and the windows on the rear elevation of it face towards the rear garden of No 54 rather than the appeal property. Given this, despite the limited distances, I consider that the proposal would not dominate the outlook from the windows or the rear garden of this dwelling at the rear.
10. The current boundary treatment prevents any overlooking between the two properties at ground floor level. At first floor level the rear elevation of No 52 currently has 2 windows but the one nearest to the property at the rear has obscure glazing. The proposal would introduce a new bedroom window which would not only be closer to the rear boundary but would also be significantly larger than any of the current windows. Although not directly facing the property at the rear, this would still allow much greater views into the garden and windows of this house. As such, the proposed extension would increase both the level of overlooking of this neighbouring dwelling, and the perception of being overlooked. As this window would be the only window serving this

bedroom, other than the en-suite window, it would not be appropriate for it have obscure glazing.

11. Overall, whilst I consider that the appeal scheme would not be detrimental in terms of its impact with regard to outlook from No 1, I have found that it would unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 1 Arderne Road with particular regard to privacy. Accordingly, it would be contrary to Policy L7 of the TCS which, amongst other things, requires that developments do not harm the amenity of future occupants and/or occupants of adjacent properties. It would also conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure development provides a high standard of amenity for existing and future users (paragraph 130).

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR