



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/23/3326077

10 Edinburgh Close, Sale, Trafford M33 4EZ

- 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 Hujun Yin against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application 110529/HHA/23, dated 18 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is extension to ground floor front elevation to include new entrance and hallway and new rooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the living conditions of the neighbours at No.7 Radley Close, with regard outlook.

Reasons

3. No.10 Edinburgh Close (No.10) is a detached two-storey dwelling located at the head of the cul-de-sac on a corner plot. To the front, sited perpendicular to the dwelling, is an existing detached double garage with a pyramid shaped hipped roof.
4. A single storey extension is proposed to the front of No.10 which would project around 7.2m from the existing front elevation toward this double garage. The proposed extension would have its external wall outside the existing gable end of No.10, extending to the side around 300mm closer to the side boundary of the property in common with No.7 Radley Close (No.7).
5. No.7 is a detached two-storey dwelling with a broadly L-shaped plan, which is slightly splayed away from its rear boundary (common with No.10). No.7 has itself been extended over two-storeys to the side and there is an existing close relationship with the detached garage of No.10 which forms part of the boundary. The rest of the common boundary is formed by an existing close boarded timber fence of around 1.9m in height. Although the proposed extension has been offset from this boundary by around 1.1m, it would be only around 8.5m from the rear elevation of No.7 (at its closest point) and would be a height of around 2.5m (to eaves), so clearly visible above the existing fence.
6. The proposed projection of the extension means it would fill much of the space between the host dwelling and the detached garage (leaving a gap of only

- 1.3m for access), resulting in an expansive brickwork elevation. The width of the extension would be around 4m resulting in a relatively shallow roof pitch, but its ridge (at 3.5m) would nonetheless sit only just below the cill of No.10's first floor windows.
7. Whilst slightly splayed from the common boundary, because of its siting the existing outlook from No.7 is toward the flank of No.10, but also between this flank and the detached garaged, which is an open aspect. I observed on my site visit that because of the relative heights, the existing fence would not almost entirely conceal the new extension, as suggested by the appellant. Rather the flank elevation and roof plane would appear unduly dominant when viewed from the rear windows and garden of No.7. It would significantly enclose the open aspect afforded by the existing space between No.10 and its garage and would appear overbearing and oppressive for these neighbouring occupiers.
 8. There would therefore be a clear conflict with the advice in the Council's *Supplementary Planning Document: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (2012)* (SPD4) that the positioning of an extension too close to a neighbours boundary can result in an uncomfortable sense of enclosure and a large expanse of brickwork can be overbearing.
 9. The appellant refers to considerable planting on the side of No.7 (within the rear garden) which 'far exceeds the height of the extension.' I observed on site, however, that this planting has since been cut right back and therefore find it offers no mitigation for, or screening of, the proposal. Nor should such landscaping be relied upon as it is outside the control of the applicant.
 10. I acknowledge that some people prefer to extend their existing homes, rather than move, and that the proposed extension would meet the needs of the present occupiers of No.10 by providing additional living (office) space, a hall and cloakroom. Whilst these are benefits of the proposal, they do not outweigh the harm that I have found to the outlook of the neighbours at No.7. Further, I am not persuaded that improved privacy to the front, semi-public, driveway of No.10 should be at the expense of the outlook of neighbours.
 11. Accordingly, I conclude on the main issue that the proposed extension would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No.7 through loss of outlook. In addition to the conflict with SPD4 identified above, the proposal would conflict with Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) which requires development to not prejudice the amenity of occupants of adjacent properties by reason of visual intrusion.

Conclusion

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

R Jones

INSPECTOR