



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2018

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 June 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/W/18/3197757

Open land adjacent to 201 Birch Lane, Dukinfield, SK16 5AT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for approval of reserved matters required by conditions of an outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Prashant Modi (D&P (NW) Ltd) against Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00062/REM, dated 6 October 2017, sought approval of reserved matters pursuant to conditions Nos 1 & 2 of planning permission Ref 17/00062/OUT granted on 25 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is residential development comprising of 4 dwellings.
 - The reserved matters for which approval is sought are: appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Prashant Modi (D&P (NW) Ltd) against Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dwellings upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in an area which is predominantly characterised by two storey dwellings. There are small terraced houses opposite the site and the pub on the opposite corner of Dewsnap Lane has a dual pitched roof with gables at the sides. However, the dominant building style comprises of semi-detached houses with hipped roofs. These are numerous and provide a consistency of design within the general area. The proposed gabled roofs would look dominant and bulky in comparison with the prevailing building style.
5. I appreciate that nearby two-storey semi-detached houses have gables on their front elevations but these are formed by two symmetrical gables with individual roofs and the secondary parts of the front elevations are set back significantly from the gables. In the case of the appeal houses the front gable would have one roof spanning both properties and the set-backs from the gable on the

front elevation would be minimal. This would result in a bulky design which would be unattractive in its own right and would be incongruous with the surrounding dwellings.

6. In addition, the rear elevations and roof planes would be dominated by wide three-storey gables which would compound the bulk and incongruence of the proposed dwellings. Trees along the rear boundary of the site would be removed and the 2nd floor elevations would be taller than the clinic behind. Therefore, in spite of a few other nearby trees, the rear of the dwellings would be visible from Dewsnap Lane and from the residential development behind the clinic.
7. I note that there would be a 2m fence along part of the Dewsnap Lane frontage but it would be quite short in length and as it would enclose rear gardens, I consider that it would be acceptable providing that it were of a suitable design. However, this is a minor detail which does not outweigh my main findings.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Tameside Unitary Development Plan Policies H10 and C1 which indicate that the design and external appearance of proposed housing development should be of a high quality and that the existing townscape should be respected. It would also conflict with the Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document which indicates that the proportions of surrounding buildings should be taken into account in new development.

Other Matters

9. I note the appellant's comments that the Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicates that there is particular pressure on the stock of dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms in Dukinfield and that demand exceeds supply. However, this factor does not outweigh the harm I have found. I have taken into account all other matters raised including representations from interested parties but none outweigh the conclusions I have reached.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons I dismiss the appeal.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR