The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2022 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/22/3291361
108 Ash Road, Denton, Manchester, M34 2WJ

- 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 Michael Moran against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref 21/00836/FUL, dated 6 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2021.
- The development proposed is first floor side and rear extension above previously approved ground floor extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor side and rear extension above previously approved ground floor extension at 108 Ash Road, Manchester, M34 2WJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00836/FUL, dated 6 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: Ground floor plan 04, First floor plan 05, Proposed elevations 06, Location Plan 07.

   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.

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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling, set back from the road in a residential area. The area includes a mix of housing types with the opposite side of the street defined by two-storey terraced dwellings in contrast to the host property which lies within a series of semi-detached dwellings.

5. The spaces between many of the pairs of semi-detached dwellings are an important characteristic of the area. However, the value and contribution of the remaining gaps has been diminished in some instances, particularly at ground floor level, through the construction of various extensions and garages. There was previously an existing garage to the ground floor of the host property that had been removed at the time of my site visit and No 106 Ash Road possesses a two-storey extension, with hipped roof, to the shared boundary.

6. Policy RED5 Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2010) (SPD) outlines the principles for the design of side extensions. The proposal would meet the requirements of most of these, including the minimum setback at the upper floor of 1 metre to reduce terracing and the roof style would match that of the original house. However, it would not meet the requirement to be set away from the side boundary by 1 metre. Nevertheless, I note that a single storey side and rear extension to the dwelling has previously been approved and whilst I do not have the plans before me, it is indicated that the ground floor would extend to the shared boundary with No 106 and would not therefore be set back from it.

7. Whilst the proposed side extension would extend to the shared boundary, it would be set back from the existing front elevation of the property at both ground and first floor levels and would have a hipped roof to match both the existing roof and the roof of the neighbouring property. I accept that the visual gap between the pairs of semi-detached dwellings in the locality of the proposal is a positive characteristic of the area, however, due to the neighbours existing two storey extension and the approved single storey extension, the visual gap in this case has already been significantly reduced and is currently limited to the first floor. The addition of a first-floor extension in this context, with the mitigating set back and set down of the roof would not unduly harm the character and appearance of the area. This is reinforced by the visual characteristics of the terraced properties facing the proposal on the opposite side of the road where there are no spaces between the dwellings.

8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not result in any unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area and would not conflict with policies 1.3, C1 and H10 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan (2004). These policies taken together seek amongst other things to ensure that development complements the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would also accord with the design requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matter

9. I have taken into consideration points raised by the neighbouring occupiers regarding the potential overhanging of the extension over the boundary. However, I regard this to be a private matter between the two parties and this issue does not have any impact on the planning merits of the proposed development.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. A condition specifying that the development is undertaken in accordance with the approved drawings is necessary to provide certainty. In order to protect the

character and appearance of the area a condition that specifies that matching materials to the host dwelling are used in the development is also necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR