



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2020

by **Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/20/3251980

29 Mollets Wood, Denton M34 3TW

- 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 Scott Piddington against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00094/FUL, dated 17 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey rear extension, two-storey rear/side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located within an area characterised by residential properties. The road, in front of the appeal property, bends slightly towards its junction with Broadhurst. As a result, three detached two storey dwellings to the west of the property are orientated at an angle. This means that the flank boundary of the appeal site is splayed, with the plot widening towards the rear. A driveway is to the side, while there is a modest sized front garden and an enclosed rear garden.
4. It is clear from the submitted plans that the proposed side and rear extension would be set back from the front elevation and down from the host dwelling's ridge line. In this regard, the appeal scheme would accord with Policy RED1 of the Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). However, this policy also sets out that: the scale and mass of the dwelling must not be significantly altered by an extension. The width and depth of the proposed side and rear extension would, in my view, be of a significant scale and mass despite the considerable set back proposed from the front elevation.
5. Even if I judged the scale and massing of the proposal to be acceptable, SPD Policy RED5 explains that the roof of a side extension should be in the same style as the original house. The proposed roof form would not be the same as the host dwelling's which is characteristic of properties in the area. The

proposal's design and external appearance would not therefore respect the local townscape character. I consider that this, in combination with the scale and massing of the proposed side and rear extension, would lead to a form of development which would contrast sharply with the host dwelling and the surrounding environment. Moreover, the proposed design would unbalance the semi-detached pairing that the appeal property forms part of. The effect of the proposed development would be harmful especially when the appeal property is viewed from the junction of Broadhurst and Mollets Wood. In part this is caused by the bend of the road, but it remains the case that development should be sensitive to the character of the local area. The use of matching materials and landscaping would not overcome the harm that I have identified.

6. My attention has been drawn by the appellant to a number of schemes locally. The examples at 30, 31 and 32 Broadhurst are not directly comparable to the appeal scheme as they either have a matching roof form or are to the rear. I do not have full details of the schemes at 16 and 17 Mollets Wood or 33 and 37 Broadhurst before me or the reasons why the Council may have reached the conclusion that they did. Hence, I attach these examples little weight.
7. I recognise the design would allow for off-street parking and the appellant's point about the width of the proposal and permitted development rights, but this appeal relates to a scheme that seeks planning permission for development. I have also determined the appeal based on the plans that are before me even if the appellant is willing to amend their scheme.
8. As such, I conclude that the proposed development would result in significant harm on the character and appearance of the area. Thus, the proposal would not accord with saved Policies 1.3, C1 and H10 of The Tameside Unitary Development Plan Written Statement, SPD Policies RED1 and RED5 and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Jointly these seek, among other things, the layout, design and external appearance of proposed housing developments to be of high quality and be of a design that complements or enhances the townscape character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR