



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2020

by Conor Rafferty LLB (Hons), AIEMA, Solicitor

Decision by Nick Palmer BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/20/3246973

54 Palmerston Road, Denton M34 2NY

- 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 A Lyons against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01045/FUL, dated 11 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'ground floor rear extension and first floor side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The Council has stated that the design of the ground floor rear extension element of the proposal is acceptable, and refers only to the first floor side extension in its reasons for refusal. Accordingly, this recommendation relates only to the first floor side extension element of the proposed development.
4. The appellant has stated an amended plan with reference RJS129_PL_001 Rev C was submitted as part of this appeal. However, the Council confirms in its report that its decision was made on the basis of plan RJS129_PL_001 Rev C and I have therefore made my recommendation on the basis of this same plan.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling on the northern side of Palmerston Road. The property benefits from a single storey UPVC lean to side extension, positioned in front of a single storey brick side extension. As a result of these previous alterations the ground floor of the dwelling runs up to the side boundary with the neighbouring property at No.

52. No. 52 in turn benefits from an existing two storey side extension that projects up to the boundary with the appeal site. This is set back from the frontage of the appeal dwelling.

7. The surrounding area is characterised by its residential nature. There is some diversity to the housing form and pattern which differs on the southern side of the street, but the appeal proposal would be seen principally in the context of the dwellings on the north side. While the dwellings along this side of the street vary slightly in terms of design, there remains a broad consistency in the overall character, scale and arrangement. Currently the appeal site contributes positively to the existing spacing and positioning of these dwellings, which maintain spaces between each pair of semi-detached properties.
8. The proposal would involve the part demolition of the existing side extension and construction of a two storey first floor side extension in its place, which would run along the entire length of the current side elevation of the property. Policies 1.3, C1 and H10 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan Written Statement, November 2004 (the UDP) together state that new development should achieve a high standard of design that complements and respects the nature, character and appearance of the surrounding area. This is reiterated in the Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document, March 2010 (the SPD) which states at RED1 that extensions should appear subordinate to the original building and includes a section at RED5 specifically relating to side extensions.
9. The proposed side extension would comprise a hipped roof and would be constructed from materials to match the main dwelling. This would replace the different roof types and materials currently present at the property due to the lean to UPVC extension in place. However, the proposal would introduce significant additional bulk to the property which, due to being built flush with the main elevation, would not appear subservient. This would result a level of built form with dimensions that would not respect the character of the building.
10. Furthermore, the proposed side extension would result in a terracing effect with the neighbouring property at No. 52. While it is acknowledged that there is a staggered building line with No. 52 and that there is at present no gap between the properties at ground floor level, due to the proposal the dwellings would be built up to the boundary at both ground and first floor level. This would result in a loss of spacing between two sets of semi-detached properties, giving the appearance of one unbroken development of four dwellings which would dominate this section of the streetscape and appear out of place. It would represent the first example in the immediate area of a lack of space between a pair of semi-detached properties at first floor level, further highlighting the incongruous nature of the proposal.
11. RED5 of the SPD states that side extensions should either be setback by 1 metre at upper floors or by 0.5 metres at ground and upper floors. Accordingly, the appellant has stated a willingness to set the first floor element of the side extension back from the front elevation of the building line by 1 metre in an attempt to reduce the terracing effect and make the proposal appear subservient to the host dwelling. However, my recommendation is

made on the basis of the plan before me which does not include such a set back.

12. For these reasons I find that the development would have a significantly adverse visual effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would fail to comply with Policies 1.3, C1 and H10 of the UDP and with the SPD.

Other Considerations

13. The appellant has listed certain benefits of the proposal, including enhancement to the appearance of the dwelling by removing the ad hoc ground floor extensions, and the sustainable location of the appeal site. While these benefits are acknowledged, they do not attract sufficient weight in planning terms to override the harm that would arise.
14. The appellant has further stated that the appeal site is not confined by any local, regional or national statutory or non statutory designations and the proposal can be delivered without having an adverse effect on the landscape, surrounding environment, or ecological interests. These aspects of the proposal are acknowledged and represent examples of a lack of harm, which is a neutral matter that does not weigh in favour of the proposal.
15. Reference has also been made to other examples of similar development in the surrounding area, most notably No. 36 Palmerston Road. It is acknowledged that the recent development at No. 36 represents a first floor side extension that is flush with the front elevation of the main dwelling and built up to the side boundary. However, this development has not resulted in a lack of space between No. 36 and the neighbouring dwelling which would create a terracing effect like that proposed as part of this appeal. I must also consider the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the individual host property with regard to the UDP and SPD. I have considered this appeal on its own site-specific circumstances and, in view of the degree of harm I have identified, the reference to other development nearby does not alter my recommendation.
16. The personal circumstances of the appellant are also acknowledged, whereby the proposal would ensure that the family home is more efficient for the owners. However, personal circumstances will seldom outweigh more general planning considerations and the matters raised in this instance do not attract sufficient weight in planning terms to override the harm that would arise.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. Having had regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Rafferty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, the appeal is dismissed.

Nick Palmer INSPECTOR