



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2022 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by J Hunter BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/22/3292890

92 Derbyshire Lane, Stretford, M32 8DR

- 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 Laura Meakin against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 104319/HHA/21, dated 19 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear extension to existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey rear extension to existing dwelling at 92 Derbyshire Lane, Stretford, M32 8DR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 104319/HHA/21, dated 19 April 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: Site location plan – 00-01, Proposed site plan – 01-02, Proposed ground floor plan – 01-03, Proposed first floor plan – 01-04, Proposed roof plan – 01-05, Proposed front and rear elevations – 01-06, Proposed side elevation – 01-07.
 - 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 host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The host dwelling is a semi detached property, set back from the road in a predominantly residential area. The area is characterised by a mix of dwelling types and designs of dwellings. The dwelling has been previously extended both to the side and rear, with the rear extension finished in render.

5. The proposed extension would project to the existing two-storey rear outrigger and to the extended side elevation, filling in an area to the rear of the dwelling. The roof would retain the gable but would be extended which would alter the pitch when compared to the outrigger on the adjoining property.
6. Whilst the proposal would result in a relatively large extension to the rear of the property, increasing the massing of the dwelling, it would not protrude beyond the existing side and rear elevations and whilst the side elevation would appear deeper this would only be seen fleetingly from the street scene. The majority of the proposal would not be visible from the street. In addition, the proposed height and gable roof of the extension would retain the subservience of the extension respect the architectural form of the existing dwelling.
7. I conclude that the rear extension would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would not therefore conflict with Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy (2012) which amongst other things seeks to ensure that development is appropriate in its context. It would also comply with the guidance in the SPD which requires proportions and dimensions of rear extensions to reflect the main building and be proportionate to the dwelling size and the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

8. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in accordance with the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. A condition specifying that the development is undertaken in accordance with the approved drawings is necessary to provide certainty and a condition relating to materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. The proposal would not conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, which outweigh this finding.
10. 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

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

J Hunter

INSPECTOR