

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2022 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by Zoe Raygen DipURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/21/3284917

95 Winstanley Road, Sale, M33 2AT

- 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 Mrs Kerry Jones against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 103975/HHA/21, dated 23 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. In the banner heading above I have taken the name of the appellant from the appeal form as it is more complete.
4. The appellant submitted amended plans to the Council during the determination of the planning application. These were consulted upon and used by the Council to determine the application. I have considered the appeal based on these amended plans.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site lies at the corner of Winstanley Road and Cranford Avenue. It is an end terrace with an existing single storey side extension with a single pitch roof. The area is characterised by a mix of terraces and semi-detached dwellings, set back from the road and with a defined and consistent building line giving a strong rhythm to the street scene, particularly along Cranford Avenue. Corner properties, such as the appeal site, generally maintain a generous distance to the adjacent road, at least at first floor, contributing to the open character of the area.

7. The addition of a two storey extension to the side of the host property, close to the rear of the pavement, would increase the bulk and massing of the dwelling at first floor reducing the local open and spacious character of corner dwellings. Furthermore, it would also be forward of the building line along Cranford Avenue and due to its height and scale would harm the regular rhythm to the street. Due to its location, it would be prominent in the local area from a variety of viewpoints along both Winstanley Road and Cranford Avenue and for the reasons above would appear over dominant in the street scene contrary to paragraph 3.22 of SPD4: A guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations 2012 (the SPD)
8. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy, the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development is of good design and due regard is given to local character and the development is appropriate in its context.

Other Matter

9. I note the appellant's concerns regarding the Council's handling of the planning application. However, this is a matter that would need to be taken up with the Council in the first instance. In determining this appeal, I am only able to have regard to the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR