



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2023

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th October

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/23/3327544
23 Kingston Gardens, Hyde SK14 2DB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Joshua Paterson against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 23/00379/FUL dated 1 May 2023 was refused by notice dated 18 July 2023.
 - The application is for single storey extension to rear, first floor extension to front, porch structure, and reconfiguration of roof to existing side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the determination of this application a revised National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was published in early September 2023 whose main focus was not directly relevant to this appeal. Nevertheless, I have determined this appeal in accordance with the revised provisions within the Framework.

Main Issues

3. The main issues is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a fairly typical red brick semi detached suburban style house that is located within a cul de sac of very similar properties. Although there is some older development, most properties here typically exhibit simple red brick and pantile materials and have a double height box bay window to the front elevation which allows a rhythm to the streetscene to be reflected and forms a defining characteristic.
5. The principal difference between this site and its neighbours is due to both the corner plot that the appeal site occupies and the presence of an existing two storey flat roof side extension and single storey garage extension that sits fairly prominently within the streetscene here, visible as it is on approach up hill towards the cul de sac proper.

6. As mentioned above, although there are some older properties nearby, the majority of the street is, perhaps unusually, very uniform in both the age, typology and design of houses. As a result, several views around the cul de sac are defined by these uniform, double bay, semi detached, houses.
7. The proposal before me seeks to remedy the past extensions through replacing the flat roof two storey side extension with a double height extension that culminates in a partially rendered and timber clad gable feature being located to the left hand side of the property. This gable has seemingly evolved so as to encompass the single storey garage extension that currently protrudes noticeably at the front of the house. An existing rear conservatory extension would also be removed and replaced with a flat roof single storey rear extension with bi folding doors onto the rear garden.
8. In assessing this appeal, I am aware of the Council's residential design guidance¹ that seeks to enhance the design quality of proposals and enable contextual extensions to be constructed that acknowledge both the character of an area and the impact of front extensions. This aspiration is reflected in The Framework in respect of the emphasis upon good contextual design and its impact upon sustainable development.
9. In this case, I consider that it is not so much a case of poor design, as the proposal is seemingly of a very high quality and the rear extension would certainly be of an appropriate scale, form and massing as agreed by the Council.
10. However, the main issue is the introduction of this prominent, rendered gable feature within this very uniform streetscene and upon a very prominent plot. Whether to all tastes or not, the dominance and uniformity of the double bay houses along here are a key characteristic. However, through using the proposed gable in this way, it inevitably usurps the double bay features and considerably unbalance's the pair of properties here. In this way it would also inevitably affect the streetscene.
11. In considering this impact therefore, despite the tasteful design, ultimately the dramatic change here would result in a harmful intervention into the streetscene that would usurp an important characteristic of the area and would undermine the overriding design and character of the streetscene.
12. Even with giving great weight to the improvement upon the streetscene through the removal of the flat roof extension and protrusion at ground floor, the proposed solution would be too great in its unbalancing of the pair of houses here.
13. As a result, and on balance, I consider that the proposal would cause sufficient harm to the character and appearance of the street scene so as to lead it into conflict with Policies H10 and C1 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan (2004) and policies RED1 and RED9 of the Tameside Residential Design Guide (2010).

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal

¹ Tameside Residential Design Guide SPD (2010)

A Graham

INSPECTOR