

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2019

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th April 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/19/3219642
157 Sunnyside Road, Drolysdon, M43 7QL

- 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 Ms Anthonia Nwanze against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/00725/FUL dated 8 August 2018 was refused by notice dated 9 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on (1) the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at No. 159 Sunnyside Road with reference to outlook, and (2) the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

3. The appeal property is an end terrace dwelling in a short row comprising of three properties. The appeal property adjoins No. 159 Sunnyside Road which is situated to its west. This neighbouring property has a single storey rear projection, although, the appeal property's previous two storey addition extends further past it into the rear garden.
 4. The proposal seeks to add a single storey extension to the rear of the dwelling, beyond the previous two and single storey extensions to the property. Given the combined projection of the previous two storey extension and the current proposal, along with the siting of these elements close to the common boundary with No. 159, I consider the development would result in an unacceptable impact on the neighbouring occupiers outlook. Although the Appellant states that the sense of enclosure would not be made worse from the original two storey extension, I do not agree, as the single storey appeal proposal would result in a greater length of development close to the boundary with the neighbouring property at No. 159.
-

5. As such, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant adverse harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at No. 159 Sunnyside Road as a result of overbearing impact. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies 1.3, C1 and H10 of The Tameside Unitary Development Plan (UDP), which require, amongst other matters, development to ensure that there is no unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. It would also conflict with the Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Paragraph 127), which seeks a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Character and Appearance

6. The appeal property is situated in a row of properties that have regular features such as a hipped roof form. I was able to see at the time of my visit that the appeal property had been subject to various alterations, including rendered external walls that had altered its appearance. However, the appeal dwelling remains like others set back from the road, behind front garden and parking areas, which gives the area a unified, cohesive character.
7. The Council have raised concerns that the proposal would represent a further addition to a property which has already been substantially altered. Whilst I recognise the proposal would result in a further addition, given its single storey scale and siting to the rear of the dwelling, I do not consider that the development would fail to be a subordinate addition.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not unduly harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area and as such, it would not conflict with Policies 1.3, C1 and H10 of UDP, which seek, amongst other matters, high quality design. It would also not conflict with Section 12 of the NPPF or the aims of the SPD.

Conclusion

9. I have found in the appellants favour in relation to the effect on character and appearance. However, I conclude that the appeal proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
10. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR