



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 December 2024

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/24/3351752

14 Ashbourne Drive, Ashton Under Lyne, Tameside OL6 9BH

- 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 Wioleta Marta Wlosowicz against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 24/00352/FUL.
 - The development proposed is an entrance porch to the front elevation and two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance of the area; and the effect on the living conditions of the residents of 36 Bakewell Avenue with regard to outlook and privacy.

Reasons

3. The proposal includes a front porch but the concerns relate to the side extension. This would extend the existing dwelling by continuing its two-storey form into the side garden. The properties in this area are relatively uniform in appearance. Whilst the appellant suggests that the layouts of corner plots are irregular, I found there to be a number of road junctions, such as this, where the houses have a similar relationship, albeit with variations with regard to the scale of the gap between the neighbouring corner houses.
4. The adjacent property, 36 Bakewell Avenue, has already had a similar extension which has resulted in a more limited gap remaining between these houses. However, the gap remains sufficient to enable each house and gable to be viewed distinctly within its own setting. This proposal would erode entirely the perceived gap between the houses.
5. The neighbouring extension has changed the relationship between these properties and does, to some extent, distinguish this corner from the other corner properties in the immediate area. However, if extended as shown, these properties would appear cramped given the proposed proximity of their gables and lack of space between them. This relationship would appear incongruous and would detract from the character and appearance of the area. The proposed relationship would result in poor design in this particular context.

6. Given the above, the proposal would be contrary to the design aspirations of the first paragraph of policy C1 and the second part of policy H10(a) of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan 2004 (UDP). Furthermore, the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 is clear that development that is not well designed should be refused.
7. The proposal would not meet the numerical requirements or design guidance set out within policies RED2 and RED5 of the Tameside Residential Design: Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD). However, these are generally directed at avoiding terracing between houses within the same row. I do not consider the requirements to be particularly relevant in this situation. Having a continuation of development, rather than a subservient addition, would similarly not be out of keeping generally. The divergence from the SPD does not therefore weigh against the proposal in these circumstances.
8. The council is also concerned with regard to the impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring residents at 36 Bakewell Avenue. The extension would entirely enclose the rear garden areas with regard to any outlook towards the east. This outlook is already extremely limited. The further reduction, although not positive, would not result in unacceptable harm.
9. The new extension would allow direct views, down from the new bedroom window, into the rear garden of number 36. This relationship would not be too dissimilar to that of the existing bedroom window; and would also be comparable to the views from the windows within number 36. The position of the new window could be perceived as being more intrusive but again, given the already intimate inter-relationships between these properties, I am not persuaded that this would be unacceptably harmful. I am also mindful that no objections have been received from the neighbouring residents.
10. Reference is made to permissions granted for extensions to corner properties at 14 Hazelhurst Road and 43 Ashbourne Drive. These, like the extension of number 36, do not entirely close the gap between houses as now proposed. They therefore offer only limited weight in favour of this proposal.
11. The expanded living space would result in a more comfortable and functional environment for the household and would improve residential amenity and well-being. UDP policy H10(a) and the Framework seek high standards of amenity for existing and future users and provide support for this element of the proposal. The works would also make a significant contribution to the local economy.
12. The changes to the living conditions of the residents of 36 Bakewell Avenue with regard to outlook and privacy would not be unacceptably harmful. I have found that the proposal would result in social and economic benefits that weigh in its favour. However, the development would also result in harm to the character and appearance of the area causing environmental harm. On balance, I conclude, that the matters that weigh in support of the proposal, when taken together, would not be sufficient to outweigh my main concern. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton
INSPECTOR