



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2020

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/20/3251140

3 Peel Avenue, Hale, WA14 2UG

- 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 Dr Ashworth against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 99413/HHA/19, dated 26 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of single storey garage and construction of two storey rear outrigger.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. A revised plan was submitted with the appeal that proposes to retain an existing 12 pane sash window in the side elevation of the property. The Council has had the opportunity to comment on this plan through the appeal process, and I do not consider that any other party would be prejudiced by my acceptance of it. I have therefore taken the revised plan into account in my determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within the Hale Station Conservation Area, which encompasses a historic suburb centred on the attractive Italianate station buildings. It is characterised by large individual suburban villas designed in the Arts and Crafts style. The significance of the conservation area stems from its large number of well-preserved buildings and spaces that reflect the historic development of the area, particularly during the late 19th and early 20th centuries.
5. The appeal property is an attractive semi-detached dwelling that is constructed in brick, with a slate roof and timber sash windows. It was likely constructed in the 1850s¹ and therefore pre-dates the later expansion of the area. It is identified in the Hale Station Conservation Area Appraisal (2016) as a 'positive

¹ According to the submitted Heritage Assessment (Garry Miller Historic Building Consultancy, October 2019)

contributor' to the conservation area, and it is significant locally for both architectural and historic reasons.

6. The proposed extension would be 2 stories in height and would significantly increase the size of the host property. Due to its corner location, it would be relatively close to the street and would be prominent in views along Spring Road. Given its size and outward projection it would also be visible from Peel Avenue to the west. The height and depth of the extension would significantly increase the bulk of the property in these views, and the change in levels across the plot would serve to amplify its height. It would also partially obscure some localised views across the site to the rear of properties fronting Ashley Road and would reduce openness at the rear of the property. Moreover, the development would introduce a number of uncharacteristic features that would contrast sharply with the host property. These would include a 2 storey element that would project beyond the flank wall, an eaves dormer window, and an east facing gable end (in contrast to the existing hipped roof profile). In combination, these features would result in a bulky and discordant addition that would harm the appearance of the host property, and its contribution to this part of the conservation area. Whilst the development would preserve features such as the existing 12 pane sash window, and would use traditional styles and materials, that does not alter my concerns in this regard.
7. The development would involve the demolition of an existing garage at the rear of the property that was approved in 1999 (Ref H/47870). This is a modern single storey structure that is modest in scale and subservient to the host property. Whilst its removal would reinstate some of the original openness at the rear, this would be more than offset by the size and incongruity of the proposed extension. In my view, any benefit derived from the removal of the garage would be limited and significantly outweighed by the harm associated with the development.
8. There is no record of the Council's Conservation Officer being consulted regarding the development. However, it is up to the Council whether it chooses to seek specialist advice. In this case, I have a detailed assessment before me in support of the reason for refusal.
9. Separately, the development proposes the loss of a chimney stack at the rear of the property. However, this is shorter and less attractive than other chimneys positioned on the roofslope, and it is not mirrored on the adjoining property at No 1. Its loss would not be unduly harmful in my view. In addition, the rear of the semi-detached pair is not symmetrical at present, as is asserted by the Council. However, these matters do not alter my other concerns regarding the development, as set out above.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Hale Station Conservation Area. This harm would be 'less than substantial' in the context of Paragraphs 195-196 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'). However, there are no public benefits associated with the proposal that would outweigh this harm.
11. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies L7 and R1 of the Trafford Core Strategy (2012), and guidance in the Framework relating to designated heritage assets.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR