



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 May 2022

by K A Taylor MSC URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/22/3294171

22 Capesthorne Road, Dukinfield SK16 5BG

- 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 Peter Mee against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01294/FUL, dated 15 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 February 2022.
 - The development proposed was originally described as '*extension & alterations*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises two storey front extension, two storey side extension and new front porch. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.
3. I am satisfied from the evidence, that the Council do not find the proposed two storey side extension, to be unacceptable, neither did the Officer's report conclude on the front porch to be unsatisfactory. My deliberations and decision are therefore focused solely upon the two storey front extension.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two storey front extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is within a predominantly residential area on an estate which is characterised by mostly two-storey brick dwellings of varying design. The majority of dwellings within Capesthorne Road share similar features of projecting canopies, integral garages, bay windows and are of open plan front gardens with driveways. There have been alterations and extensions, but these appear to have retained original proportions and are of limited front projection.
6. The appeal property forms a detached dwelling within a spacious plot with a gable roof, bay windows and a double projecting front garage with a dual pitched roof. Despite some variation in form, the properties in the area present a discreet arrangement that appreciably contributes towards the local character.

7. The proposal would result in a front projecting two-storey extension incorporating the existing double garage. A new first floor would be formed with an additional bedroom and w.c. The proposal would result in an excessively sized front extension, protruding at two storeys from the original building line of the dwelling. Due to the width, height and projection at first floor, the extension would be of a significant scale and mass to the detriment of the host properties façade. Thus, it would appear overpowering to the frontage and be out of proportion with the characteristics, and architectural style of the original host. This would be further exacerbated by the large protruding side gables and the minimal set down at first floor from the main roof ridge.
8. Furthermore, it would not be reflective of the street scene, creating an unwelcome focal point within the cul-de-sac, particularly due to the position of the property, the excessive scale, massing and height from the design of the front extension. Therefore, it would appear unduly dominant and as an incongruous addition, disrupting the rhythm and scale of existing detached dwellings within the immediate and wider street scene.
9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed two storey front extension would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policy C1 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan Written Statement, 2004. This policy requires consideration of the surrounding fabric to be respected, and design relationships between buildings and their settings.
10. It would also conflict with Policy RED1 and RED9 of the Tameside Residential Design, Supplementary Planning Document, 2010, which sets out that an extension must acknowledge the character of the house and wider area, creating an extension that complements rather than dominates including architectural style and that scale and mass must not be significantly altered. It also advises that front extensions that disrupt the existing building, do not align with the existing dwelling and its surroundings, or be appropriately proportioned and detracts from the existing street scene & character will rarely be considered acceptable.

Other Matters

11. I note the personal circumstances of the appellant, and I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in the Equality Act 2010. The Act sets out the relevant protected characteristics which includes disability. However, the particular needs and circumstances of the appellant could change whereas the harm I have identified would be permanent. Moreover, I have seen no evidence to warrant the overall scale of the two storey front extension. Therefore, I do not find they justify nor outweigh the harm I have found, and the dismissal of the appeal is therefore necessary and proportionate.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan, taken as a whole and there are no other material considerations, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

K A Taylor

INSPECTOR