



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 May 2022

by K Savage BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/21/3274628

2 Hall Drive, Mottram SK14 6LH

- 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 Alan Holt against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01049/FUL, dated 27 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension, at 2 Hall Drive, Mottram SK14 6LH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01049/FUL, dated 27 October 2020, 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: 100 (Existing Ground Floor Plan); 101 (Existing First Floor Plan); 103 (Existing Elevations); 104A (Proposed Floor Plans); 105A (Proposed Elevations); 106 (Existing and Proposed Site Plans).
 - 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a detached dwelling on the southern side of Hall Drive. The street is characterised by detached dwellings set back from the highway. Dwellings on the southern side stand slightly below the level of the road owing to the sloping topography and are generally similar in form and design, with flat fronted façades in red brick, broad windows at ground and first floor, porches to the front and garages to one side. Those to the northern side stand above the level of the road and are more individual in design, with some bungalows and dormer bungalows. Several of the dwellings within the street have been subject to extension.

4. The appeal dwelling is one such property, with permission granted in 2019 (Council Ref 19/00932/FUL) for a two storey extension to the eastern side of the dwelling, a single storey extension to the western side, a part single/part two storey rear extension and a front extension. Works were underway on site at the time of my visit, and the 'as existing' drawings submitted by the appellant reflect the development as approved.
5. The proposal before me seeks to add a first floor level over the approved single storey garage extension on the western side. The proposal would effectively 'square off' the dwelling, with the extension aligning with the main front elevation and continuing the main roof slope across. The extension would project 2 metres beyond the main rear elevation.
6. The Council points to the street being characterised by dwellings in spacious plots, and argues that the proposal would result in an excessive scale of development on the site that would appear cramped between the dwellings to either side. It refers to guidance of its Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (March 2010) (the SPD). Policy RED1 sets out that developments should apply an architectural style that reflects the existing dwelling; use materials that align with the existing in terms of size, style, colour and texture; and be subordinate to the original dwelling. Policy RED5 states that side extensions should be set back from the main elevations and side boundaries, and should have roofs in the same style as the original house.
7. The extension would not be recessed from the front elevation, nor would it include a step in the roof line. This would run contrary to the guidance of the SPD in terms of the extensions being set back and appearing subordinate. However, the first floor extension approved in 2019 to the other side of the dwelling similarly does not have a recessed front elevation or stepped roofline, and from the plans before me, it is evident that the approved scheme will already alter the overall form and scale of the dwelling, with the original part of the dwelling no longer defined within the overall elevation. The dwelling would maintain the same roof style, however, in line with Policy RED5.
8. Moreover, I saw examples of dwellings within the street with broad footprints and no subordination to their massing, including Nos 6, 9 and 16. The appellant points to these and other dwellings which have extended to occupy the majority of the width of their plots, such as at Nos 8 and 12. A notable example is No 14, which has been substantially extended to the front and rear and forms an imposing feature of the street scene.
9. Given this context, the proposed first floor extension would reflect the surroundings in terms of the form and pattern of extensions. Moreover, there are several examples of dwellings standing close to one another following the addition of side extensions, which have narrowed gaps which previously existed, particularly at first floor level over garages. In view of this, the proposed widening of the first floor level of the appeal dwelling would not be uncharacteristic of the pattern of development within the surrounding area.
10. In terms of the site itself, the eastern side would retain some 2 metres to the side of the garage of No 4, with a significantly larger gap between the first floor levels. The proposal would bring the first floor level within around one metre of the boundary on the western side, with a further gap of around three metres to the side wall of the neighbouring dormer bungalow, The Hollies. Having observed the site from the street and the rear garden, I am satisfied that the

proposal would not result in a dwelling that would appear excessive in size or unduly cramped within the site, nor overly dominant in the street scene.

11. The extension would continue the style of the existing dwelling in materials to match. The front elevation would include a gable feature above the proposed front window that would reflect similar to the opposite end and would add a degree of articulation to the frontage. The overall form and materials would respect the character of the surroundings and would accord with Policy RED1 of the SPD in these respects.
12. Therefore, whilst the proposal would not wholly accord with the guidance of the SPD in terms of subordination, for the reasons set out, I conclude that the proposed extension would preserve the character and appearance of the area, and so would accord with Policies 1.3, C1 and H10 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan (November 2004), which together require high quality design which understands and respects the distinct townscape character of the Borough; and for extensions to compliment or enhance the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Other Matter

13. The Council did not refuse the application on the basis of harm to neighbours' living conditions. The neighbouring dwelling, The Hollies, has two windows facing the appeal site which are indicated to serve non-habitable rooms. Nevertheless, outlook to this side is already limited by the existing dwelling and would not be materially worsened by the proposal. No windows are proposed to the side elevation and no loss of privacy would therefore occur. The overall depth of the extension at the rear would not be significant and would not lead to an overbearing effect on the neighbouring property. The position of the extension relative to the neighbouring dwelling and the path of the sun would not lead to a harmful loss of sunlight or daylight. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposal would not undermine the living conditions of neighbouring occupants.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition setting out the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. It is also necessary to require external materials to match those used on the existing dwelling house, in order to secure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

15. The appeal scheme accords with the development plan, taken as a whole, and there are no material considerations which indicate that permission should nevertheless be withheld. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

K Savage

INSPECTOR