



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2020

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/20/3244243

94 Granada Road, Denton M34 2LA

- 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 Steven Wynne against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00650/FUL, dated 19 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and two storey side extension at 94 Granada Road, Denton M34 2LA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00650/FUL, dated 19 July 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Block Plan (Drawing No 17.1670.3), Proposed Details (Drawing No 17.1670.2E).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Steven Wynne against Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached house, brick-built and with a tiled hipped pitched roof, which is typical in appearance of the neat

predominantly residential area in which it sits. It is situated on a plot at the corner of Granada Road and Repton Avenue, with garden areas to the front, side and rear of the property. The shallow front garden is enclosed by a low brick wall with railings above, while the side and rear garden is screened from the street by a wooden fence approximately 1.8m high. A gate provides access from Repton Avenue to an off-street parking space in the rear garden.

5. The proposal is to erect a two-storey side extension, which would project around 3.4m from the side elevation and have a length of around 9.2m. The single storey element at the rear would project approximately 3m from the existing rear elevation of the host property. The submitted drawings show a double bay window on the front elevation, a lean-to roof on the single storey part, and a hipped roof on the two-storey side extension to match the roof of the existing property. The proposed materials are brick and tiles to match the existing.
6. The extension would complement the style and proportions of the host dwelling, and the houses in the wider area. It would comply with guidance in the Council's March 2010 Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) in that its roof would be of the same style as the original house, and the ridge line would not extend above that of the existing roof.
7. In certain other regards, the proposal would not comply with the guidance in the SPD. The side extension would not be setback from the front elevation of the host property, and the side elevation of the extension would sit forward of the front building line of the houses in Repton Avenue to the rear of the appeal site. As a consequence, the extension would read as being subordinate to the host dwelling. However, the well-defined building line on Granada Road would not be broken, and because of the space at the entrance to Repton Avenue there would not be a harmful terracing effect when the development was viewed along Granada Road. Seen from within Repton Avenue, the separation between the rear of the appeal property and the neighbouring house at No 1 is such that the extension would not, in this case, dominate or be harmful to the street scene in that road.
8. There are several examples of extensions nearby which are similar to the current proposal in terms of their design, scale and massing. These include No 92 Granada Road, on the opposite corner of Repton Avenue from No 94, and Nos 100 and 102 Granada Road which are on opposite sides of the entrance to Melton Avenue. These are all very close to No 94, and from the street outside the appeal property can be viewed together. They therefore help to define the character and appearance of the area surrounding the appeal site. Although the Council is of the view that these other cases highlight how harmful such extensions can be to the locality, that assertion is not explained or justified in the evidence before me, nor supported by what I observed at the time of my site visit, where they appeared in keeping with the generally neat and orderly character of the area. While the proposed extension does not therefore comply with every element of the guidance within the SPD, it is nonetheless in keeping with, rather than detrimental to, the character and appearance of its immediate surroundings, which is the overall aim of the SPD.
9. Taking all the above points together, and notwithstanding the limited conflict with some of the criteria set out in the SPD, I conclude that the extension would not be unduly prominent or harmful to the character and appearance of

the area. The proposal therefore complies with Policy H10 of the November 2004 Tameside Unitary Development Plan, which among other things seeks to ensure that the layout, design and external appearance of housing development complements the character and appearance of the surrounding area. For the same reason it accords with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of design.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have specified the approved plans so as to provide certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area I have also included a condition requiring materials matching the existing dwelling to be used for the extension.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

M Cryan

Inspector