

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

**by Richard McCoy BSc MSc DipTP MRTPI IHBC**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 07 August 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/17/3177169**

**59 Park Road, Hale, WA15 9LS**

- 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 Ian Moss against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 90546/HHA/17, dated 8 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2017.
  - The development proposed is the demolition of single story lean-to structures and erection of a part single/part two story rear extension.
- 

### Procedural matter

1. The Council amended the description of development to "erection of single storey side and part single/part two storey rear extension with other alterations including additional windows". The appellant had no objection to this change. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

### Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of single storey side and part single/part two storey rear extension with other alterations including additional windows, at 59 Park Road, Hale, WA15 9LS, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref90546/HHA/17, dated 8 February 2017, 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: drawing nos. 811-PL-01, 811-PL-02 and 811-PL-03 rev A.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
  - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) upon first installation the windows in the ground floor and first floor in the side elevation facing northeast shall be fitted with, to a height of no less than 1.7m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level is no less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and retained as such thereafter.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the South Hale Conservation Area.

## Reasons

4. No. 59 is a semi-detached dwelling situated within the South Hale Conservation Area. This is characterised by brick built semi-detached and detached dwellings set in generous grounds. The proposed two storey extension would be positioned to the rear while the single storey extension would be to the side and rear of the existing dwelling. In addition, all new and replacement windows and doors (including to the ground floor window on the front elevation) would be of a timber frame and pattern to match windows on the host and in nearby dwellings. Proposed external materials and finishes would match those of the existing dwelling.
5. I observed that when seen from Park Road, no. 59 is generally defined by its half-hipped front elevation, arched first floor window, large box bay ground floor window and brick facings. These design features are repeated across neighbouring dwellings and largely account for the positive contribution they make to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. I further observed that the rear of the appeal site is not readily seen from the public realm and that the proposal would only be seen in glimpsed views from the road.
6. In my judgement, the front elevation, from which the positive contribution the dwelling makes to the character of the Conservation area is mainly derived, would be enhanced by the proposed replacement window while the part of the proposal that would be seen in oblique views from the road would match the host in terms of scale and detailing. In overall terms, the siting, scale, design and massing of the proposal would enable it to politely integrate with the established architectural detailing and form of the host building and surrounding area such that it would preserve the character of the Conservation Area.
7. Accordingly, the proposal would not conflict with Policies L7 and R1 of the adopted Trafford Core Strategy and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document, *A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations*, which reflect Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
8. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of the tests and advice within the NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance. I agree that conditions are necessary in respect of commencement time, relating the development to the submitted plans and materials, in the interests of providing certainty and protecting visual amenity. In addition, I agree that a condition in respect of obscure glazing is necessary on windows in the side elevation to safeguard the residential amenity of the occupiers of no. 61.
9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Richard McCoy* Inspector