



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 May 2018

by W Johnson BA (Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 May 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/18/3195594

21 Cemetery Road, Mossley, Tameside, Lancs OL5 9PQ

- 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 Gerard Henshaw against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00767/FUL, dated 4 September 2017, was refused by notice dated 8 January 2018.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey side extension
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Cemetery Road is a tree lined cul-de-sac located off the Staley Road. The properties located on Cemetery Road comprise of a mixture of dwelling types including semi-detached houses and bungalows, detached houses and bungalows and terraced properties. Additionally, the road provides access to Princess Close and Mossley Cemetery.
4. The host dwelling forms part of a small group of semi-detached houses on the same side of the road, which are similar in form and appearance and do not appear to have been significantly altered when viewed from Cemetery Road. In particular they have no 2-storey extensions that are clearly visible when viewed from the front. Although, some of these dwellings have had single storey extensions or detached garages erected at the side of the main property, which contributes to the balanced form and regular rhythm of development to the street. It was noted on my site visit that the appeal site slightly differs from the majority of the dwellings on Cemetery Road through occupying a larger plot, which in turn provides a more generous side space.
5. Whilst there is no specific policy objection to the principle of a residential extension, I note that the appeal scheme would provide a significant amount of additional accommodation when compared with the original property. It is acknowledged that the host dwelling already benefits from an existing single storey extension, which projects the full width of its side space. This extension

already has a visual effect through its wide appearance on the existing property and therefore forms part of its character and appearance.

6. The proposed 2-storey side extension would echo features contained within the host dwelling, such as the hipped roof and fenestration details. It would comprise of a family room at ground floor and a bedroom with en-suite at first floor, and due to the change in levels, a utility room would be formed at basement level. The scheme would occupy a similar footprint to the existing single storey extension, and would again be built up to the common boundary with No 19, providing no side space. Due to a stagger in the building line between the host dwelling and No 19, there would be no terracing effect created. Additionally, I note that no objections have been raised by the Council in relation to the effect on living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, in particular No 19, and I too consider the proposal not to be harmful in this respect.
7. It is acknowledged that the proposal would be set back from the front elevation of the main dwelling by 0.45m. However, this would still result in an overly wide addition to the host dwelling. In this instance, it is considered that a greater set back would be necessary to retain an acceptable mass in accordance with the guidance contained within RED5 of the Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document. Furthermore, whilst a lower ridge would be created through the scheme being set back from the rear elevation, this would not provide sufficient mitigation or relief to overcome the harmful effect of the proposal through its excessive scale and massing, and its resultant bulky appearance on the host dwelling, when viewed from Cemetery Road. These factors would diminish and unbalance the character and appearance of the host dwelling to the detriment of the wider street scene.
8. For all of these reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed 2-storey side extension constitutes an incongruous development that would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the existing house and the surrounding area. This would be contrary to Policy H10 of The Tameside Unitary Development Plan that seeks high quality design in layout, design and external appearance of housing developments that in turn complement the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It also fails to accord with RED5 of the Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document that amongst other things seeks to ensure that side extensions are designed to respect the scale of the existing building and those surrounding it. As a result, the proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which amongst other things seeks to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Wayne Johnson

INSPECTOR