



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2018

by **David Fitzsimon MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th November 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/18/3203387

41 Peterborough Close, Ashton-U-Lyne, Lancashire OL6 8XW

- 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 Dhremesh Mistry against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/00171/FUL, dated 12 February 2018, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2018.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension and existing garage conversion to habitable room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a modern, detached property which sits on the corner of Peterborough Close and Brecon Crescent. The proposal includes a single storey extension which would be added to the side of the host dwelling. This extension would be very wide and deep and its shallow pitched roof would not respond well to the traditional gabled roof of the main dwelling. The overall scale and form of the proposed extension would not reflect the architectural style and proportions of the host dwelling. It therefore conflicts with policy RED1 of the adopted Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Furthermore, the extension would breach the well established and clearly defined building line of the nearby dwellings of Brecon Crescent immediately to the east, contrary to policy RED5 of the SPD.
 4. These factors lead me to the view that the proposal would be an unsympathetic addition to the host dwelling and it would fail to respect the established pattern of development within the immediate locality. The retention of the mature conifer trees to the Brecon Crescent boundary of the appeal property would only partially screen the proposed addition and the visual harm would be readily visible from Peterborough Close and the highway junction.
-

5. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits. In such terms, it conflicts with policies C1 and H10 of the adopted Tameside Unitary Development Plan and the SPD, which promote good design that responds well to its surroundings.
6. I have been referred by the appellant to extensions at a number of residential properties within the Borough. However, I do not know the precise planning circumstances behind these developments. In any event, I have considered the appeal proposal on its individual merits and against the context of the particular street scene within which it would sit.
7. In light of the above factors, and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR