

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2023

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

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 19<sup>th</sup> June 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/23/3317688**

**13 Buxton Lane, Droylsden, Tameside M43 6HL**

- 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 Z Fanning against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 22/01142/FUL, dated 21 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2023.
  - The development proposed is a gable extension and floor over existing garage; and single storey morning room extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a first floor extension over the existing garage and a rear single storey extension. The council's concerns relate only to the side extension.
  4. The garage is just over 4.6 metres wide. It is set in from the side boundary but this distance tapers significantly towards the rear due to the angle of the property and that of Moorland Avenue. Given the relatively close position of the corner of the rear of the proposed two storey element to the Moorland Avenue pavement, it would result in an extremely dominant feature on this corner plot. The houses to the rear are set back from the road and the current arrangement allows for a relatively open aspect when leaving Moorland Avenue to join Buxton Lane, given the low level of the existing garage. The increased height proposed would detract significantly from this open aspect. Generally, in this area, buildings are set back from the junctions of side roads with Buxton Lane, particularly at two storey level and this proposal would depart from this established pattern.
  5. The council are also concerned about the width of the extension in comparison to that of the house. Whilst the house width is wider, the extension would represent a substantial addition. The scale of the extension would be at odds with the proportions of the house. The corner position results in the house
-

being relatively prominent in the street scene and this would be further emphasised by the forward position of the extension and the proposed front facing gable. These design details and the scale of the frontage would add to my concern with regard to the over dominance of the addition when considered with regard to the properties within Moorland Avenue.

6. Overall, the proposal would detract from the relatively open character of this corner plot, certainly at first floor level; it would be at odds with the character of the properties in Moorland Avenue as it would extend so close to the road; it would unbalance the appearance of the dwelling which would represent poor design; and it would be overbearing when passing the property when entering or leaving Moorland Avenue. It would result in a cramped and overly dominant appearance that would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would represent poor design in this particular context as it would not have regard to the prevailing characteristics of the wider area or this specific junction.
7. Given my conclusions, the proposal would conflict with policies C1 and H10 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan 2004 as it would not respect the existing townscape character or complement the character or appearance of the surrounding area. Although these policies are now of some age, as they generally accord with the design aspirations of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, I afford them full weight. Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document 2010 requires at policy RED1 that the scale and mass of the dwelling should not be significantly altered and extensions should be subordinate to the original building whilst policy RED5 advises that extensions on corner plots must not break well defined building lines. The proposal conflicts with this guidance which adds to my concerns.
8. I am mindful that the existing structure of the garage offers significant benefits with regard to the practicality of adding a new extension as currently shown. The proposal would also offer improved living accommodation for the appellant and result in economic benefits from the investment required. These matters weigh in favour of the proposal.
9. Reference has been made to other extensions in the area and specific reference has been made to 24 Buxton Lane. That extension does not appear to extend quite so close to the side boundary and appears to be slightly narrower in size. It is also associated with a different house design. However, that extension would appear to be very similar to this proposal given its relationship to the junction with Keston Avenue. No information has been provided with regard to its date or the other circumstances that led to that extension being built. I cannot therefore assume that it was approved under the current planning policies or that the council has been inconsistent in its current approach. In any event, it does not demonstrate that this proposal would be acceptable. There is also an extension at 21 Buxton Lane which has some similarities but that property is of an entirely different layout.
10. Revised plans have been submitted. These would result in the front of the extension being set further back and the front gable being removed resulting in a simpler hipped roof. These revisions, although an improvement, do not overcome the concern with regard to the width of the extension, its proximity to the boundary or the conflict with the building line of Moorland Avenue.

11. In conclusion, although no objection has been raised with regard to the single storey addition, the two storey element would detract from the character and appearance of the area. Whilst I have considered all the matters put forward in support of the proposal, these do not outweigh this concern. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

*Peter Eggleton*

**INSPECTOR**