The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2020

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/W/20/3249492
Brooklands Lodge, Marsland Road, Sale, Cheshire M33 3NE.

- 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 Brooklands Lodge MCR Ltd against the decision of Trafford Council.
- The application Ref 99165/FUL/19, dated 18 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 February 2020.
- The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension to provide 4 additional guest bedrooms.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the host building as a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

3. Brooklands Lodge is a substantial detached property operating as a guest house located on the corner of Marsland Road and West Grove. The surrounding area is characterised by a variety of property types. The appeal building is identified as one of the first villa style properties in the area, in a typical Italianate suburban style, built in 1851 and is locally listed.

4. The appeal property has an attractive symmetry to the Marsland Road frontage due to its architectural detailing including symmetrical canted bays, stone quoins and hipped slate roof. A gap at upper level between the neighbouring building to the east provides an important visual break in development which allows the symmetrical elevation to be appreciated. Although I accept that the site is well contained, as a detached structure in reasonably spacious surroundings it is a prominent part of the street scene.

5. The building's interest lies in its connection with the historical and architectural growth of the suburbs, its architectural character, and its contribution to the historical and architectural development of the area. Therefore, even if the level of significance of the building in the wider national context is considered to be low, it is important in the local context.

6. The proposed two storey side extension would replace an existing detached garage. Although designed to read as a later addition, set down from the roof line and back from the front elevation, the extension would not be sufficiently recessed or limited in height to appear subservient to the existing building. Rather, due to its form, scale and design the extension would unbalance the building's symmetrical appearance and appear utilitarian next to its ornate detailing. As a result, the proposal would be an incongruous feature when viewed from the street and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

7. In accordance with paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework, I have taken into account the effect of the development on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset and I find that, on balance, the extension would be detrimental to the architectural character of the building and hence its significance.

8. I recognise the significant weight placed on supporting economic growth in the Framework, however, I am mindful that whilst supporting economic growth the Framework also seeks to achieve development that is well designed and sympathetic to local character and history.

9. Overall, for the reasons given, I consider that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the host building as a non-designated heritage asset. This would conflict with Policies R1 and L7 of the Trafford Local Plan Core Strategy which together seek to ensure development enhances the character of the area by appropriately addressing matters of design and taking account of historic distinctiveness. It would also conflict with the Framework.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR