



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 March 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by F Wilkinson BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/24/3357523

9 Beech Avenue, Droylsden, Manchester M43 6FR

- 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 Karol Bedkowski against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0824/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of side two-storey extension and rear single-storey extension and associated internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on:
 - the living conditions of the garden users of 11 Beech Avenue with regard to sunlight and outlook; and
 - the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Living conditions

4. The appeal building is an end terrace property as part of a block of 4 dwellings adjacent to a matching block of 4 other terraced properties. The appeal dwelling and its detached neighbour, 11 Beech Avenue, share a boundary, and their gardens are side by side. There is a low close boarded timber fence and hedge separating the properties.
5. By reason of its length along the shared boundary with No.11, coupled with its height and blank featureless appearance the proposed rear extension would dominate views for users of the rear garden of No.11. While the single storey extension is marginally set away from the common boundary, its height would further exacerbate this effect. This visual dominance would result in an oppressive structure which would feel overbearing to garden users to the detriment of their living conditions.

6. The appeal site's slightly elevated position combined with the proposed rear extension's height, length and orientation would result in overshadowing to the rear garden of No.11. This would adversely affect its use and enjoyment by its occupants. The hedge and fence boundary treatment separating the properties are much lower than the total height of the rear extension and thus would not sufficiently mitigate its adverse effects.
7. The proposed development would therefore be unacceptably harmful to the living conditions of occupants of 11 Beech Avenue with regard to outlook and sunlight. As such it would fail to comply with Policy H10 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan (2004) (UDP) which, amongst other matters, requires housing developments to have no unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. There would also be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) where it requires development to have a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Character and appearance

8. The appeal site is a two-storey property in a residential area. Beech Avenue consists of other similar properties with gardens to the front and rear. The proposed two storey extension would comprise a hipped roof form to match the existing and would be modest in width.
9. The Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (2010) ('the SPD') provides guidance on two-storey side extensions regarding design and form. I recognise that the proposal would conflict with advice set out in Policy RED5 of the SPD as it would not utilise a setback in order to prevent the 'terracing effect'. However, due to the proposed side extension's hipped roof design and modest width it would be read as an extension to the wider terrace and would not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the host property and surrounding area.
10. Furthermore, given the predominantly terraced character of the area, the extension would respect the overriding character of the area. This is particularly the case as there is no great sense of openness owing to the densely developed nature of the surrounding built form. The size, scale and position of the extension would therefore be readily absorbed into the existing dwelling and as part of the wider terrace within the street scene. As such, the continuation of the terrace would not result in any harm to the host property or the overriding character of the area.
11. With this in mind, the scheme would not conflict with Policies 1.3, C1 and H10 of the UDP which require development to achieve high quality design that's well integrated into its context and complements or enhances the built environment. There would also be no conflict with the design objectives of the Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

F Wilkinson

INSPECTOR