



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2024

by Alison Hartley, LLB(Hons), Solicitor, MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26TH February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/23/3335597

59 Westminster Road, Davyhulme, Trafford, M41 0RW

- 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 & Mrs E Quibell against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 111368/HHA/23, dated 7 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Issue

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been updated since the parties' appeal submissions have been made. However, as the revisions do not affect the matters under consideration in this appeal, it was not considered necessary to seek further comment.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a previously extended two-storey semi-detached house of brick construction situated on a corner plot at the crossroad junction of Westminster Road and Hartford Road. The area surrounding the appeal site is characterised predominantly by detached and semi-detached dwellings of similar design. At the crossroads of Hartford Road and Westminster Road, none of the four corner properties have two storey extensions at their side elevation to the road. This includes the northern section of Hartford Road between Westminster Road and Lostock Road. This contributes to the sense of spaciousness and maintains the general building line at two storey level on both roads notwithstanding the single storey extensions in place.
5. The appeal proposal would enable a first-floor extension above the existing extension at the roadside boundary with Hartford Road. I find that the proposal would be out of keeping with the spacious character of the area as it would disrupt the general building line at the second storey level at a corner plot at the crossroads. It would appear over dominant and incongruous in the street-

scene, eroding the sense of spaciousness. Although the proposal has been designed to be in keeping with the design of the host building and subservient to it, I find that this does not overcome the fundamental concerns with scale, massing and proximity to the side boundary in its context.

6. My attention has been drawn to examples of approved two storey side extensions at corner plots in the wider area¹ and an appeal decision.² Although within the wider area of the appeal proposal, the approved applications and appeal decision each differ from the appeal proposal in their context and physical characteristics. For example, the road context, such as a cranked alignment or T-junction arrangement as opposed to a crossroads; road widths; position of trees and vegetation; larger distance over two metres between the extension and side boundary; distance less forward of the building line; or the relationship with other existing development in the vicinity.
7. I therefore find that the other examples of approved two storey extensions are sufficiently different to the appeal proposal that they are not precedents. As such, they are of limited weight in my decision.
8. My attention has also been drawn to two refused applications for two-storey side extensions³. One of these decisions is the most proximate to the appeal site of the examples. Nevertheless, I have given limited weight to the decisions which pre date the current Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy (January 2012) (LP) and the Trafford Borough Council Supplementary Planning Document 4 – A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (February 2012) (SPD4). Whilst the aims of the former policies are likely to have been similar in terms of assessing impacts on character and appearance, the weight that can be attributed to those decisions is therefore limited.
9. Overall, the existence of other two storey extensions on corner plots in the wider area does not outweigh the identified harm to the spacious character of the immediate street scene caused by the appeal proposal.
10. For the above reasons I find that the proposal harms the street scene and character of the area. It therefore conflicts with Policy L7 of the LP, which requires development to be appropriate in its context, and enhance the street scene or character of the area by appropriately addressing scale and massing.
11. The proposal would provide approximately two metres separation distance from the side boundary, in line with SPD4. However, SPD4 also states that the distance may need to be increased when considering two storey extensions on corner plots where there is an identifiable building line, as is the case here. The SPD also advocates single storey side extensions at corner plots rather than two-storey. The proposal therefore conflicts with SPD4.
12. The Framework paragraph 139 is engaged which states that development that is not well designed, particularly where it fails to reflect local design guides, should be refused.

¹ 105 Canterbury Rd, Davyhulme Ref H/69728, dated February 2010; 207 Canterbury Rd, Davyhulme Ref H/68177, dated December 2007; 92 Westminster Rd, Davyhulme Ref 80679/HHA/2013, dated July 2013; 7 Rochester Rd, Urmston Ref 76862/HHA/2011, dated May 2014; 19 Sherbourne Rd Ref 98291/HHA/19, dated February 2020; 139 Canterbury Rd, Davyhulme Ref 106875/HHA/22, dated June 2022

² Ref APP/Q4245/A/09/2115534, dated 3 February 2010

³ 163 Canterbury Rd September 2005 ; 54 Westminster Rd March 2005

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons I find that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that outweigh the harm caused by the proposal. The appeal should be dismissed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR