



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by M Clowes BA (Hons) MCD PG CERT (Arch Con) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/22/3304983

22 Tanhouse Road, Urmston, Manchester M41 8RA

- 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 Miss Justine Taylor against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 106951/HHA/22, dated 2 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension with a double storey side extension. A porch to the front of the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies at the corner of Tanhouse Road and Brecon Avenue. It is a semi-detached dwelling with a detached single storey garage to the side. The area is characterised predominantly by 2-storey semi-detached dwellings, set consistently behind short front gardens that results in a degree of homogeneity and rhythm to the street scene. There are a limited number of bungalows to the south-east on the opposite side of Brecon Avenue.
4. Although there is some variety in the orientation and shape of corner plots within the vicinity of the appeal site, nonetheless they typically have wider side gardens or driveways. As a result, the appeal site has an important function along with other corner plots, in contributing to the spaciousness of the street scene.
5. I am referred to the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations 2012 (SPD), which advises that proposals for extensions to corner properties should not be visually over-dominating or disrupt the sense of openness between properties and the street scene. Specific criteria are stated including that the proposed extension should take up a small proportion of space between the property and the back of the pavement with a minimum separation of 2m; is in keeping with the building line; should be set back from the front corner of the house, be single storey rather than 2-storey and the design minimise the visual impact on the street scene.

6. Sited adjacent to the existing boundary fence at the rear of the pavement, a minimum separation distance of 2m would not be achieved. The scale and mass of the proposed 2-storey side extension would therefore reduce the space, particularly at first floor level, between the dwelling and Brecon Avenue. I saw that there are no other dwellings in corner plots within the vicinity of the appeal site that are positioned so close to the road and pavement.
7. Although there is no building line to disrupt to the rear of the appeal site due to the lack of built development, and a gap of 17m (as cited by the appellant) would remain between the proposed flank wall of the extension and 20 Tanhouse Road, the proposed development would nonetheless appear as a cramped and uncomfortable form of development. It would enclose and dominate the western side of the entrance to Brecon Avenue, given its 2-storey height, eroding the spaciousness of the street scene. I accept that the existing garage is located adjacent to the side boundary of the plot. However, being single storey and flat roofed it is of a much smaller scale such that it does not harm the spaciousness of the street scene. Its presence does not therefore, justify the proposed 2-storey extension.
8. The proposed hipped roof would not reflect the prevalent roof form of the host dwelling or neighbouring dwellings of the same house type. Hipped roofs found within the vicinity of the appeal site are limited to those on the bungalows further to the south-east along Tanhouse Road and single storey side extensions, both of which are different forms and scales of development. Furthermore, the proposed hipped roof would not reduce the scale or bulk of the proposed side extension at first floor level.
9. Whilst a set-back would be incorporated at first floor level, the proposed ground floor garage would be flush with the existing front elevation, contrary to the SPD guidelines. A symmetrical design, use of matching materials and a complimentary fenestration pattern to the host dwelling, would not mitigate the harm arising from the scale, height and proximity of the proposed side extension to Brecon Avenue. The design has not therefore mitigated the visual impact of the proposal as required by the SPD.
10. The proposed single storey lean-to rear extension would be small-scale in nature and views from Brecon Avenue would be limited by the presence of the existing boundary fence. Although it would increase the overall scale of the proposed development, it would not in itself have a significant impact upon the character and appearance of the area.
11. Whilst I have found the single storey rear extension to be acceptable, I conclude that the proposed 2-storey side extension would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) which seeks amongst other things, to ensure development is appropriate in its context in terms of scale, height and massing, objectives shared with the SPD. It would also conflict with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which requires high quality design that is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

12. The appellant considers the proposal to be sustainable development in accordance with the Framework. However, paragraph 12 of the Framework

indicates that development that conflicts with an adopted development plan should usually be refused. Moreover, the Framework shares similar aims to the development plan in terms of protecting an area's character and appearance. Accordingly, I find the policies of the Framework taken as a whole, not to weigh in favour of allowing the appeal.

13. I have had regard to other matters raised by an interested party including the impact of the proposal on their living conditions, namely light and outlook. The Council did not refuse the proposal on such grounds. As I am dismissing the appeal on the main issue for the reasons given above, I have not addressed these matters further.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, and all other considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

M Clowes

INSPECTOR