



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2023

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/23/3326384

47 Foxhall Road, Timperley WA15 6RW

- 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 and Mrs Cable against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application 110311/HHA/23, dated 16 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is Two Storey Side and Single Storey Rear Extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the host house and wider streetscene.

Reasons

3. No.47 Foxhall Road (No.47) is a two-storey semi-detached house located on the north side of Foxhall Road, behind a small front garden and driveway. To the side of No.47 is a lean-to car port, enclosed by gates at the front, and it is proposed to demolish this and construct a two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
4. The guidance in the Council's *Supplementary Planning Document, SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (2012)*(SPD4) is that side extensions should be designed so as to ensure that they do not appear unacceptably prominent, erode the sense of spaciousness within an area, or detract from a dwellings character. In respect of semi-detached properties, SPD4 explains that poorly designed extensions can unbalance the symmetry of the properties and to avoid this should not be excessively wide, ideally be set back from the front elevation and not dominate the dwelling to detract from the original character.
5. I observed on my site visit that No.47 is the last of a group of houses on either side of Foxhall Road that are similar in design and form, with characteristic facing gables finished in render with timber detailing, ground floor bay windows and projecting porches. A number of houses within this group have been altered and extended but there nonetheless remains an attractive rhythm and uniformity to the streetscene. The proposed side extension would project over two-storeys and around 3.5m from the existing flank elevation of No.47, so

half its existing width. Because of its location at the end of the group, there is a generous space between No.47 and its neighbour at No.49 Foxhall Road which is of a different design, with a simple hipped roof form. Despite extending half the existing width, the proposed extension would still be well offset from the boundary with No.49 such that there would remain a sense of spaciousness between the two houses.

6. However, the proposed extension would continue both the front building line of the host house (which is behind the facing gable and bay window) and the ridge of the original pitched roof. Whilst I appreciate that the intention of this design was to try to ensure that the extension was not highlighted as an addition, the result is that it would fail to appear as subordinate to its host, rather appearing unduly prominent. No.47's attached neighbour (at No.45 Foxhall Road) has been extended over two-storeys to the rear and this addition is partially visible off the flank gable. Despite this, and the differences in the finish of the semi-detached pair (a combination of brick and render), it retains broadly symmetrical in appearance. It is accepted that any extension to the side of No.47 would unbalance, to a degree, this symmetry. However, the combination of its width and absence of any set back from the front elevation, or set down from the ridge, means that the proposed extension would appear disproportionate in scale and would disrupt the symmetry to such a degree to cause harm to the character of the semi-detached pair.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to other extensions to houses on Foxhall Road, considered similar to the appeal proposals. I do not have full details of these extensions, including when they were built, but I observed on my site visit a number of different extensions and alterations to the group of houses on Foxhall Road, including No.21 Foxhall Road (No.21) which I accept is very similar to the proposal before me. The majority of the extensions I observed were, however, offset from the front elevation and do not continue the original ridgeline of their host, having a set down, hipped or single pitch roof form. I find such a design approach ensures that the extension remains subordinate to the host house and is more successful in assimilating it into the uniform streetscene. For this reason, I find the extension to No.21 lends little support for the appeal proposal.
8. Therefore, I conclude on the main issue that the proposed side extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host house and wider streetscene. Consequently, in addition to the conflict with SPD4, the proposal would conflict with Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy, Development Plan Document (2012) in so far as it requires development to be appropriate in its context and enhances the character of an area by appropriately addressing scale, height and massing. It would further conflict with the principles of achieving good design in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

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

R. Jones

INSPECTOR