



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 July 2023

by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/23/3319185

44 Manley Road, Trafford, Sale M33 4FN

- 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 Lowri Gwyn-Wallace against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 109237/HHA/22, dated 15 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 February 2023.
 - The development proposed was originally described as double storey side extension, rear single storey extension, associated internal alterations, front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two-storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No 44 is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling. The residential area is primarily characterised by similarly designed two-storey, semi-detached dwellings which were designed to have driveways separating them. This results in a regular streetscene with spaces between houses being important in defining the character and appearance of the area. The building line of this part of Manley Road follows the curve of the road.
4. The proposed development includes several elements, but the Council's concern relates to specifically the two-storey side extension. The extension would be set back slightly from the front elevation, and the roof's design would respect the host dwelling. Matching materials are proposed.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document SPD4: A guide for designing house extensions and alterations (2012) (SPD) provides guidance in relation to proposals for two storey side extensions or first floor additions. It states that a gap of a minimum of 1m should be retained between the side elevation of an extended property and its side boundary, to retain the impression of space to the side of the dwelling. The proposed extension would not comply with the SPD's minimum requirement of 1m to the side boundary.
6. The neighbouring dwelling, No 46, has recently constructed a two-storey side extension. The first-floor element of the extension is set in approximately 1m from the boundary which helps to retain the spaciousness character of the street. There are numerous other two-storey side extensions within the locality

which have to a degree eroded the character of gaps to the side. There are cases where a 1m gap to the side boundary has not been maintained, and the appellant has drawn my attention to such cases. However, there are very few examples where adjacent dwellings both have two-storey side extensions and the gap between the dwellings has been significantly eroded¹.

7. My attention has also been drawn to a similar application and associated appeal decision². There are some similarities between that proposal and the scheme before me. Having said that, Mosley Road does not form part of the street scene and therefore the context of the sites cannot be directly compared. I do not have full details of this scheme, or other two-storey extensions in the locality, and so cannot be certain that the circumstances are the same. In any case I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.
8. There is a lack of consistency in the design of two-storey side extensions in the street scene, but in general they have been designed to respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Most dwellings in the street scene do not benefit from a two-storey side extension and therefore gaps to the side continue to make an important contribution to the area's character and appearance. Furthermore, I observed on my site visit that extensions that do not maintain a reasonable gap to the boundary served to confirm that such extensions appeared cramped and erode the sense of spaciousness.
9. The proposed two-storey side extension, and the loss of the space between Nos 44 and 46 would result in the extension appearing confined. As a result of the limited gap to the side boundary as well as the extension's scale and massing, it would appear cramped and would fail to respect the street scene's prevailing residential pattern. This is because it would result in a large extension that would erode the open space between Nos 44 and 46. The resultant limited gap between No 44 and No 46 would give rise to a terracing effect. Consequently, by reason of the two-storey side extension's design, scale, massing and proximity to the common boundary, it would not enhance the street scene or character of the area. Therefore, the unsympathetic extension would appear incongruous and visually intrusive.
10. There is a telegraph pole situated on the pavement between Nos 44 and 46. Given the slim nature of the pole, contrary to the appellant's assertion, it does not have a significant impact upon the appeal site and is not a prominent feature. The proposed extension would have a significantly greater impact on the spaciousness and character of the area than the telegraph pole due to its scale and massing.
11. I acknowledge the other matters raised by the appellant, including that the proposal would not result in harm to residential amenity or parking, an email, and shared access. Nonetheless, the other matters raised do not outweigh the harm I have found, and the extensions highlighted do not represent justification for harmful development at the appeal site.
12. For the reasons given above, the proposed two-storey side extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy L7 of the Trafford

¹ Examples include 5 and 7 Manley Road, 29 and 31 Langdale Road

² APP/Q4245/D/20/3254266

Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012). This states development must be appropriate in its context and enhance the street scene or character of the area. It would also not comply with the SPD which seeks to ensure that extensions are of high standard design, are compatible with and not harmful to local character. In addition, it would conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure developments are sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, and all other material considerations, the appeal does not succeed.

L Wilson

INSPECTOR