



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 May 2024

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U4230/D/24/3337849

18 Hawthorn Drive, Salford M6 8FU

- 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 Patten against the decision of Salford City Council.
 - The application PA/2023/0412, dated 23 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is two storey front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the two-storey front extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene.

Reasons

3. No.18 Hawthorne Drive (No.18) is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located at the head of Hawthorne Drive, a short residential cul-de-sac off Wilton Road.
4. I observed on my site visit that Hawthorne Drive is characterised by semi-detached dwellings, with a hipped roof form and two-storey bay, constructed in red-brick with a part render finish. No.18 has previously been extended to the side, with a two-storey side extension which replicates the original bay.
5. It is now proposed to construct a two-storey front extension centrally between the two bays to accommodate a porch at ground floor, and enlarged bathroom at first floor. The extension would have a width of around 2.65m and would project around 1.2m from the principal elevation of its host. The scale of the extension means it would effectively result in the loss of the characteristic two-storey bays; it would be offset only around 0.2m from either bay and project 0.9m forward of them. Rather than providing a strong focal point, which the appellant considers is currently lacking, I find the extension would appear a discordant addition, unsympathetic to the design of its host.
6. I recognise that the advice at paragraph 44 of the National Design Guide is that well designed places do not need to copy their surrounding in every way, and that it is appropriate to introduce elements that reflect how we live today. I also agree with the appellant that deviating from the traditional norms does not inherently cause harm. However, although the fenestration and finish of No.18

is contemporary, it has retained the hipped roof and bays that, as I have described, contribute to the character and appearance of Hawthorne Drive. The size and siting of the proposed extension to No.18, whilst designed with a hipped roof, would become the dominant feature of the dwelling to the detriment of the wider streetscene, particularly given its prominent position at the head of the cul-de-sac. A single storey porch of the scale afforded permitted development rights by Schedule 2, Part 1, Class D of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) would not, in my view, result in a similar level of harm.

7. Consequently, I conclude on the main issue that the proposed two-storey front porch extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the streetscene. It would therefore conflict with policies D1 and D2 of the Salford Local Plan, Development Management Policies and Designations (2023) (LP) which together require high quality design that protects, enhances and responds to any positive character and distinctiveness of the local area. It would further conflict with LP Policy D8 which requires alterations and extensions to existing buildings to respect the character, rhythm and proportions of the original building and avoid masking any key architectural features.

Conclusion

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

R Jones

INSPECTOR