



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2023

by D Hartley BA (Hons) MTP MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date :9 June, 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/23/3316529

14 Luxor Grove, Denton, Tameside M34 2NR

- 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 Mrs Kim Warner against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01023/FUL, dated 10 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is a side extension to replace existing prefabricated garage with a proposed first floor bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Luxor Grove is an established residential street and includes brick built semi-detached dwellings of similar design and appearance. Each is set well back from the main road and, in the main, there is a consistency of gaps between buildings at upper floor level. These attributes give the immediate area a sense of design synergy and spaciousness. They add positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the locality.
4. While the two-storey side extension would include matching materials and a continuation of the ground floor canopy roof, its front elevation would be flush with the existing front elevation of the semi-detached dwellinghouse. Owing to this, coupled with the width of the side extension, I find that it would materially upset the balance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellinghouses. To the passer-by, it would not appear subordinate in scale to the host property and owing to its position, width and scale, would have a harmful terracing impact. Furthermore, the proposed side extension would detract significantly from the rhythm and consistency that is afforded to the gaps between most of the semi-detached blocks of properties in this street. Hence, the side extension would be experienced as an incongruous addition.
5. The appellant has referred me to examples of other two-storey side extensions that are flush with the original front walls of properties. I acknowledge that a significant number of similar extensions do appear to have been built

elsewhere in the area. Nonetheless, the focus of my assessment has been based mainly on the impact of the proposal on the distinctive and positive characteristics that exist in Luxor Grove. The appellant has, however, referred me to similar extensions at 1, 3, 21 and 28 Luxor Grove. I do not know the exact circumstances which led to these extensions being constructed. They are, nevertheless, the exception rather than the norm in Luxor Grove and are not so prevalent in number that they have fundamentally altered the aforementioned distinctive and positive characteristics of the street.

6. In addition to the above, the proposal would directly conflict with policy RED5 of the Council's Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD) which requires, as a minimum, that *'side extensions should either be setback by 1m at upper floors or setback by 0.5m at ground & upper floors. This helps to reduce a terracing effect and may help ensure the existing scale and mass is retained'*.
7. While the single storey side extension at 12 Luxor Grove is set well back from the front elevation of the main house, this is not sufficient to overcome the harm that would be caused to the balance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellinghouses, or the unacceptable terracing impact. Neither this, nor the desire for increased bedroom space, outweighs my conclusion on the main issue.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not accord with the design, character and appearance requirements of policies C1 and H10 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan 2004, policies RED1 and RED5 of the SPD and chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development would not accord with the development plan for the area taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

D Hartley

INSPECTOR