



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2021

by R Hitchcock BSc(Hons) DipCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/20/3264079

15 Arnold Road, Gee Cross, Hyde SK14 5LH

- 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 Lomax against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00902/FUL, dated 16 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing single storey side garage extension and replacement with new two storey side extension comprising ground floor store, new entrance and first floor bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its locality.

Reasons

3. The site lies adjacent to a public footpath and an area of public open space at the end of a row of semi-pairs set within a residential estate. The building lies behind a landscaped front garden set below the level of the road with an inclined driveway. The pairs of properties on the road have consistent modern design with uniform brick and tile finishing that provide a sense of place and distinct character to the immediate locality.
4. The house has previously been extended at ground floor to provide, amongst other things, a front-facing entrance integrated with a garage. The proposal includes the removal of an existing single-storey side extension for replacement with a two-storey addition with eaves and ridge lines to match the main part of the house. The proposal would utilise complementary materials.
5. The regular design of the semi pairs and spacing between them provides a strong sense of rhythm and consistency to development along the street. On Arnold Road, various forms of extension and alteration have taken place to some of the houses. However, the majority of these are single storey with a subordinate appearance which preserve the proportioning and focus of the main two-storey elements of the pairs.
6. The alignment of the extension with the front elevation of the original building with matching ridge and eaves heights would integrate the extension in a manner to alter the overall massing of the semi-pair. Notwithstanding a

contrasting panel of brickwork above the main bowed window, the resultant extensive area of continuous brickwork along the building's frontage and large roofscape would give rise to a bulky appearance that would shift the focus and visual interpretation away from a semi-pair to that of a short terrace. The width and matching height of the extension would compete with the scale of the original two-storey part to undermine it as the focal element and remove the strong sense of symmetry with the adjoining dwelling.

7. Whilst the architectural styling would be similar to the existing building, the significant additional width of the extension would cause the combined building's massing to stand out in the consistent pattern of local development and sharply contrast with the prevalent scale of development in the streetscape. Although it would be positioned at the end of the row, the proposal would fail to retain the regular rhythm of development and principal proportions of the paired buildings to jar with the predominant appearance of the dwellings in the locality.
8. This design approach would directly conflict with the requirements set out in Policies RED1 and RED5 of the Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document [2010] which seek to preserve the aspects of scale, mass and styling of existing buildings and their context. This includes the subordinate sizing and positioning of side extensions.
9. In support of the proposal, the appellant has referred me to a number of cases in other streets where two-storey extensions have been added to similar properties, including side extensions aligning with the main front elevations. Of these, I observed that the majority were more limited in width and included elements designed to break up the resultant massing. There is little detail before me in respect of the circumstances of a comparable example at 5 Hillcrest. However, this example is in the minority and precedent is rarely an argument that should carry great weight in planning decisions which should be made on their own merits in the context of the development plan and other material considerations.
10. I also acknowledge that the site benefitted from a previous permission for a smaller side extension aligning with the front elevation. However, there is little detail of that proposal before me to enable me to draw comparisons or otherwise. It therefore carries little weight in my determination of the case, a case I have considered on its own merits.
11. For those reasons, I find that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its locality. It would conflict with Policy H10 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan [2004] as it seeks attractive design which complements and enhances the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This is a policy which is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to securing high standards of design which are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, the appeal should be dismissed.

R Hitchcock INSPECTOR