



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2023

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/23/3314323

34 Sutherland Road, Stretford M16 0HX

- 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 Aurangzeb Akbar against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref 108660/HHA/22, dated 13 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is part two storey side extension, single-storey rear extension, new rear window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed two-storey side extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. No.34 Sutherland Road (No.34) is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the corner of Sutherland Road and Trentham Road. To the side, No.34 is offset from its boundary with Trentham Road and it is proposed to extend over two-storeys filling this space. The extension would project around 3.4m from the existing flank elevation, leaving a 1.16m gap to the boundary to allow access to the garden. To the rear, a single storey extension is also proposed which would project almost the full width of the existing rear elevation (and the proposed side extension) to a depth of around 3m.
4. The Council's *Supplementary Planning Document: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (2012)* (SPD4) recognises that extensions on corner properties, between the side of the house and the road, can appear unduly prominent and obtrusive. It sets out at paragraph 3.3.3 that generally, as a minimum, a separation distance of 2m must be retained between the edge of any single storey extension and the site boundary, but that this minimum distance may need to be extended for two-storey extensions. The proposed separation distance to the site boundary, of only 1.16m for a two-storey extension, clearly falls well below this minimum distance.
5. The proposed side extension would project more than half the width of the existing front elevation and its eaves would align with those of the host dwelling. Although it has been set back slightly from the front elevation, with

the ridge of the proposed hipped roof just below the existing, the scale and massing of the extension means it would nonetheless be very prominent. I observed on my site visit that Sutherland Road is characterised by semi-detached dwellings that are regularly and well-spaced, and that the four dwellings that flank Trentham Road are all well offset from the back edge of the pavement (at first floor). This gives the appearance of a wide, well balanced road, with space for street trees within the pavements, which positively contributes to the character of the area. In combination, the scale of the proposed extension and its siting so close to the site boundary, means it would compromise this characteristic spaciousness.

6. The proposed extension would appear an incongruous addition when viewed from Trentham Road, presenting a significant and largely blank elevation very close to the pavement, and from Warwick Road, set forward of the building line of No.62 Warwick Road. I recognise that No.32 Sutherland Road (No.32), which is on the opposite corner of Trentham Road, has been extended to the side at ground floor and this appears to be less than 2m from the side boundary. I do not have full details of No.32 before me, but I found the single storey extension with a shallow hipped roof to be quite different in scale and prominence to the proposed two-storey extension now before me.
7. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposed two-storey side extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. In addition to the conflict with the guidance in SPD4, it would conflict with Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) and the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which together require development to be appropriate in its context and to enhance, or be sympathetic to, the local character of an area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Jones

INSPECTOR