



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 February 2022

**by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 28<sup>th</sup> April 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/22/3290329**

**223 Canterbury Road, Urmston, Manchester M41 0SH**

- 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 Martyn Joyce against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 105693/HHA/21, dated 27 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2021.
  - The development proposed is described as the erection of two storey side extension and single storey front and rear extensions.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey semi-detached dwelling of a style and appearance that is typical of the wider area, which appears as generally suburban and verdant in character with open with spaces between the properties and in the streetscene.
4. The appeal property has an existing single storey extension to the side of the property in the form of what the appellant describes as a converted garage. I saw at the site visit that many properties have garages, converted garages or single and two storey side extensions of a variety of designs.
5. The appeal scheme is a two storey side and single storey rear extension. The submitted plans show that the extension is set back from the front elevation of the appeal property at the first floor level by 890mm and the front plane of the roof is also set down and back. I note that the ground floor element projects forwards, in line with the existing bay window and proposed porch. To the rear, the single storey extension is the full width of the existing property and the side extension.
6. Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy, amongst other matters, requires new development to be of high-quality design and be "appropriate in its context". The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (the SPD) is also referred to and advises that for two storey side extensions or first floor additions "a gap of a minimum of 1m should be retained between the side elevation of an extended

property and its side boundary”, so as to ensure that extensions do not erode the sense of spaciousness within an area.

7. The submitted plans are annotated to indicated that the existing gap of 750mm to the boundary with the neighbouring property will remain. Clearly this is 250mm less than the 1m sought by the SPD. While the SPD does not form part of the Development Plan, the guidance is nonetheless a material consideration in the determination of this appeal.
8. The neighbouring property, 225 Canterbury Road benefits from a garage with a flat roofed extension above that is flush with the front elevation of that property. I saw at the site visit that the side elevation of No.225 appeared to be situated a similar distance to the shared boundary as the appeal scheme.
9. The appellant has referred to a nearby recent appeal decision<sup>1</sup> and planning permission<sup>2</sup> where no or a reduced gap was accepted. I note that No.11 Aylesbury included a 2m set back from the front elevation at first floor and with regard the latter case, the Council accepted a gap of 90cm from the extension to the boundary, marginally below the required 1m.
10. In combination with the existing extension at no.225, the appeal scheme would substantially close the existing gap between the neighbouring properties creating the appearance of a substantial block or terrace of built form, harming the open character of the area. The limited set back to the front elevation at the first-floor level does not mitigate the reduced, against the guidance set out in the SPD, gap to the boundary and the examples referred to by the appellant do not persuade as to the acceptability of the appeal scheme.
11. In support of the appeal scheme the appellant refers to the need to increase and improve the accommodation, specifically including a 4<sup>th</sup> bedroom to meet the needs of the appellant’s family. This is a material consideration that weighs in favour of the appeal scheme but does not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
12. For the reasons detailed above I find that the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area and thus is contrary to Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy and the guidance set out in the SPD.

## **Conclusion**

13. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area in conflict and would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that lead me to conclude that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

*Mr M Brooker*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/19/3225772, 11 Aylesbury Avenue, Urmston, Manchester M41 0SB. 10 June 2019.

<sup>2</sup> 104404/HHa/21 218 Canterbury Road, Davyholme M41 0QF