



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: 23rd July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/24/3344666
41 Davyhulme Road, Davyhulme M41 7BS

- 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 T McDonnell against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref is 113158/HHA/24.
 - The development proposed is erection of two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed two-storey side extension on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. No.41 Davyhulme Road (No.41) is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling situated on the south side of Davyhulme Road. It forms part of a row of similar gabled interwar semi-detached dwellings between the junction of Knowsley Avenue and Bedford Road with larger, detached dwellings situated to the north, on the opposite side of Davyhulme Road. I observed on my site visit that the row of semi-detached pairs is regularly spaced, set well off their respective side boundaries, and this spaciousness is important in defining the character and appearance of the street scene on this part of the south side of Davyhulme Road.
4. A two-storey side extension is proposed which would project around 2.1m from the existing western flank of No.41. It would be offset from the existing front elevation at ground floor by around 0.3m, first floor by around 2m, and would extend the depth of the host dwelling aligning with the existing rear elevation.
5. The Council's *SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions & Alterations* (2012) (SPD4) provides guidance in respect of proposals for two-storey side extensions or first floor additions. It states that a gap of a minimum of 1m should be retained between the side elevation of an extended dwelling and its side boundary, to retain the impression of space to the side of the dwelling. The proposed extension would be offset by only 0.3m from the side boundary, so well below the SPD4 minimum requirement.

6. It is acknowledged that the appellant amended the proposed side extension, such that it was set down by round 0.6m from the ridge of the host gabled roof and was set back at first floor. This minimises the scale and massing of the proposed extension and ensures it would appear subservient to its host. However, because of such a limited gap to the side boundary, it would appear very cramped on its plot. I observed that there are no examples in this particular row of semi-detached dwellings where the offset from the side boundaries has been significantly eroded and therefore the proposed extension would fail to respect the prevailing pattern of the streetscene, and would harm its characteristic spaciousness.
7. The appellant has provided a number of examples of other dwellings in the vicinity which benefit from similar two-storey, or first floor side extensions, and which have retained a separation distance of less than 1m from the side boundary. The evidence of both parties is that most of these, including those further to the east on Davyhulme Road, were approved before the adoption of the SPD4 guidance which introduced the requirement to retain a 1m gap to the boundary.
8. That said, I acknowledge that there are cases where, when assessed against the SPD4 guidance, a gap below 1m to the side boundary has been found acceptable. Whilst there are clearly some similarities between the examples provided and the appeal proposal before me, there are also differences. The appeal proposal would be offset only 0.3m from the side boundary at both ground and first floor, which contrasts with the example at No.9 Southgate where the first floor was offset by 1m. Further, No.18 Hartford Road, No.40 Salisbury Road, No.135 Canterbury Avenue and No.11 Aylesbury Avenue already projected very close to the side boundary at ground floor, again, in contrast to No.41 which is set well off its boundary. Therefore, despite some similarities, I am not persuaded that the examples provided are sufficient justification for the appeal proposal before me, which I have considered on its own merits and particular context.
9. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposed two-storey side extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene. Consequently, in addition to the SPD4 conflict, it would conflict with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024) because it fails to respect and acknowledge the character and identity of the locality in terms of siting. In addition, it would conflict with the guidance at paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure developments are sympathetic to local character.

Conclusions

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

R. Jones

INSPECTOR