



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2020

by **A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/20/3253884 70 Tennyson Avenue, Dukinfield SK16 5DP

- 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 Mrs Hilton against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00040/FUL, dated 20 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two-storey dwelling. It is located in a predominantly residential area where there are various property styles, many of which have been extended.
4. The appeal property is prominently positioned on a corner plot at the junction between Tennyson Avenue and Macauley Close. Tennyson Avenue curves round the site and there is a junction with Milton Close to the rear of the site leaving the appeal property highly noticeable at the confluence of three streets. By reason of the siting of the appeal property and the surrounding dwellings, the area around the site has an open and spacious feel which positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The appeal proposal would be constructed to the side of the property on land that currently forms a side garden. It would result in the removal of a significant proportion of this garden, which I have identified is a positive feature of the area. The size and scale of the extension would intensify the harm that would be caused and leave the resulting dwelling appearing exposed and inharmonious with the makeup of the surrounding area.
6. Despite the use of materials to match and the proposal being set-back and stepped-down from the main body of the dwelling, the bulk of the proposal would be dominant and prominent, particularly when viewed from the junctions

between Tennyson Avenue and Macauley Close and Milton Close. Whilst reasonably localised in its extent, the effect of the scheme would be to diminish unacceptably the character and appearance of the host building with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

7. I have been referred to side extensions at 136 Tennyson Avenue, 268 Yew Tree Lane and 16 Laycock Drive which I was able to see on my site visit. Although I do not have full details of these cases, I find that there are different site circumstances to that of the appeal proposal. I have in any event determined the appeal on its own individual merits.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would have a significantly adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policies C1 and H10 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan (2004) Collectively, these policies require, amongst other things, that developments pay particular attention to the relationship between buildings and their setting, and be of high quality, complementing or enhancing the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. The proposal would also be contrary to guidance contained in the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (2010) which outlines, amongst other things, that side extensions on corner plots must not detract from the street scene.
10. The proposal would conflict with guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) (2019) that outlines, amongst other things, that planning decisions should ensure that developments add to the overall quality of the area; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture; are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment; and maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of spaces, creating distinctive places to live; and that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR