



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 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: 10 June 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/20/3246633**

**15 Ashfield, Denton M34 3TL**

- 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 Stephen Cahill against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 19/00895/FUL, dated 3 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 December 2019.
  - The development proposed is described as 'second storey side extension above existing single storey side extension, internal alterations and creation of a vaulted ceiling in existing rear extension'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a second storey side extension above existing single storey side extension, internal alterations and creation of a vaulted ceiling in existing rear extension at 15 Ashfield, Denton M34 3TL, in accordance with the terms of the application 19/00895/FUL dated 3 October 2019 subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan 'Second storey side extension, internal alterations and creation of a vaulted ceiling in existing rear elevation' Drawing No. PA001 dated October 2019.
  - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed from materials matching that of the existing building.

### 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 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.

## **Main Issue**

4. 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**

5. The appeal site comprises a two storey detached dwelling in a cul-de-sac section of Ashfield. The property benefits from a single storey side extension that runs up to the side boundary with the neighbouring detached property at No. 14. The immediately surrounding area is characterised by single and two-storey dwellings, the majority of the latter being semi-detached. The dwellings are, for the most part, informally sited in relation to the road, although small groups, including nos. 14-17 follow fixed building lines. Some properties in the area have two-storey side extensions.
6. The proposal would involve the construction of a first floor side extension above the existing side extension. It would be constructed from external materials to match the existing brickwork in both colour and texture. The side extension would match the existing dwelling in terms of its architectural style and would not remodel the frontage. It would add mass to the property, but would not be disproportionate or out of scale with the dwelling.
7. The front elevation of the side extension would be flush with the existing front elevation at first floor level but set back from the forward projecting ground floor. This setback would respect the dimensions of the dwelling and ensure that the existing scale of the property is not unduly increased.
8. The rear elevation of the side extension element of the proposal would not be flush with the rear elevation of the main house but would project to the same extent as the ground floor side extension present on site. However, this projection beyond the main house at the rear would be minimal and would still be setback from the existing ground floor rear extension such that it would not appear overly dominant or significantly increase the massing of the property.
9. Trees at the front of the property would partially screen views of the extension from the street. The existing extension occupies the gap at ground floor level. The proposed extension would be viewed as part of a small group of four dwellings that includes a pair of semi-detached houses with drives to each side. Because of the diversity in the area in terms of built form and layout, with a high proportion of semi-detached houses, the reduction in the gap between the appeal dwelling and no. 14 at first floor level would not be out of character.
10. Accordingly, the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would not appear as an inappropriate addition along the streetscape.
11. RED5 of the Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document, March 2010 (the SPD) relates specifically to side extensions. It states that side extensions should either be setback by 1 metre at upper floors or by 0.5 metres at ground and upper floors, and should be set back 1m from the side boundary, although it allows for exceptions to this. The SPD explains that this would reduce the possibility of a terracing effect and would ensure existing scale and mass is retained. However, it is noted that the SPD represents guidance rather than policy, and for the reasons set out above the proposal

would not result in an unacceptable terracing effect or fail to respect the existing scale and mass of the property or the surroundings.

12. For these reasons I find that the development would complement the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area and would not be harmful. Accordingly, it would comply with Policies 1.3, C1 and H10 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan (2004) which 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.

### **Conditions**

13. The standard time limit condition as well as a condition that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans are necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have also imposed a condition which requires the materials to match the existing dwelling in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

14. Having had regard to all matters raised I recommend that the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a second storey side extension above existing single storey side extension, internal alterations and creation of a vaulted ceiling in existing rear extension at 15 Ashfield, Denton M34 3TL, in accordance with the terms of the application 19/00895/FUL dated 3 October 2019 subject to the conditions set out at paragraph 1 of this recommendation.

*C Rafferty*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

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

*Nick Palmer*

INSPECTOR