



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2024

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22ND July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/24/3344422
382 Barton Road, Stretford M32 9RL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Maqsood Ahmed against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref is 111372/HHA/23.
 - The development proposed is erection of first floor side and rear extension and single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE) was adopted on 21 March 2024 by nine Greater Manchester authorities, including Trafford Council. PfE Policy JP-P1 replaces Policy L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy (2012) (CS) referred to in the Council's decision notice, in so far as it relates to design quality. As PfE Policy JP-P1 is also referred to in the Council's decision notice, it has not been necessary to seek further views from the parties on this matter.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the first floor side extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene. The Council have raised no issue regarding the proposed single storey and first floor rear extension on the east side of the dwelling (adjacent the adjoining neighbour) and I have no reason to form a different view.

Reasons

4. No.382 Barton Road (No.382) is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the north side of Barton Road, on the corner of Edale Road. On its western side, No.382 benefits from a two-storey side extension, offset from the front elevation, with a single storey projection to the rear which aligns with an existing two-storey outrigger.
5. It is proposed to infill to the rear of the existing two-storey side extension (over the rear projection), projecting a depth of around 5.6m, offset less than 1m from the existing ground floor rear elevation. I observed on my site visit that because of its corner location, the flank and much of the rear elevation of

No.382 is already prominent in the streetscene, particularly travelling south on Edale Road towards its junction with Barton Road. The existing single storey rear projection does, however, provide some relief to the massing of the flank and rear in the streetscene, and enables the original hipped roof of the dwelling to be appreciated.

6. In contrast, the proposed depth of the first floor infill extension, and its height, although minimally offset from the existing ridgeline of the hipped roof, would significantly increase the bulk and massing of No.382 and appear a disproportionate addition to its host unduly prominent in the streetscene. It therefore fails to have regard to the guidance in the Council's *SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions & Alterations (2012)* that extensions on corner properties, between the side of the house and road, can appear unduly prominent and obtrusive and should not be visually over-dominating.
7. The proposed extension continues the hipped roof of the existing two-storey extension with a hipped gable to the rear. Whilst this, to a degree, reduces the massing, the composition of the rear elevation would appear somewhat contrived with a hipped roof adjoining the gabled outrigger; any appreciation of the original roof form would be lost. Combined with a lack of alignment and differing dimensions between the ground and proposed first floor windows, overall I find the design unsympathetic to its host.
8. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposed first floor side extension on the west side of No.382 would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider streetscene. Consequently, it would conflict with PfE Policy JP-P1 because it fails to respect and acknowledge the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, scale and size. Further, it would conflict with the guidance at paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework that planning decisions should ensure developments add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and are sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

9. I have had careful regard to the needs of the appellant, in terms of providing additional living accommodation, and notably the medical needs for an additional bedroom with connected bathroom. I also understand, and have had regard to, the concerns associated with the cost of living and availability of housing. The provision of an enlarged bedroom at ground and first floor and an additional ensuite bedroom at first floor would be a clear benefit of the proposal, to which I afford weight. However, I am not persuaded that adaptations to the dwelling, including an ensuite bedroom, could not be achieved in another way and therefore, on balance, the other matters raised by the appellant do not outweigh the significant harm to character and appearance identified above.

Conclusion

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

R. Jones

INSPECTOR