



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2024

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/24/3346621

35 Lytham Road, Flixton M41 6NN

- 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 Brian Chan against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref is 112870/HHA/24
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey extension to create additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed single storey extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and streetscene.

Reasons

3. No.35 Lytham Road (No.35) is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located at the south-east corner of Shaftesbury Gardens, a small residential cul-de-sac. Because of its corner location, No.35 is set on a broadly triangular shaped plot which splays to the rear, and to the side is an existing detached garage. It is proposed to demolish this existing garage and replace it with a single storey extension to the side and rear.
4. The Council's guidance in *SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (2012)* (SPD4) is that all side extensions, amongst other things, should be proportionate and complementary, in height and width, to the size of the original dwelling, and that side extensions over half the width of the original property can appear prominent.
5. The proposed single-storey extension would be set well off (around 3.5m) the front elevation of No.35 projecting around 5m from the flank elevation and then 'dog-legging' such that it projects a further 7m parallel with the boundary with No.37 Lytham Road. Whilst the height of the proposed extension would be relatively low (around 2.5m to its eaves), with a shallow pitched roof, the width of the proposed extension (including the 'dog-leg') would be significantly more than the existing width of No.35. In conflict with the SPD4 guidance, because of its excessive width, it would appear a disproportionate and overly prominent addition to its host.

6. The proposed extension has been well set back from the front elevation of No.35, and designed with a 'dog-leg' because of the splayed nature of the plot and in order to utilise the garden space available. Its irregular shape, configuration and footprint would, however, appear contrived and out of character with both the original style and scale of No.35. It would therefore further conflict with guidance at paragraph 3.1.7 of SPD4 which advises that such side extensions will not be looked upon favourably by the Council.
7. I observed on my site visit that the existing detached garage of No.35 is visible from the corner of the cul-de-sac, but is seen against the backdrop of bungalows facing Woodsend Crescent Road. Although wider than the existing garage, the proposed side extension would be set around 3.5m from the front elevation, parallel to it, with a low roof profile. Similar to the existing, it would be viewed in the context of the bungalows and would not significantly alter the character and visual appearance of the streetscene.
8. Notwithstanding this, I conclude that the scale, siting and 'dog-leg' design of the proposed extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of its host dwelling. Consequently, in addition to the conflict with the SPD4 guidance, the proposal would conflict with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024) which requires all development to respect and acknowledge the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size and scale. It would also fail to accord with the principles of good design set out in Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
9. I have sympathy with the appellant that, as he understood, all design issues had been resolved to the satisfaction of the Council sometime before determination of the planning application. However, this does not have any bearing on my consideration of the appeal, nor alter my conclusion above.

Conclusion

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

R. Jones

INSPECTOR