



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 May 2021 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U4230/D/21/3268797

10 Hanover Gardens, Salford M7 4FQ

- 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 Y Halpern against the decision of Salford City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/76283/HH, dated 28 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension with roof windows, loft conversion with front and rear dormers and hip to gable conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development above is taken from the application form however a more precise description is provided in the decision notice and the appeal form as 'A single storey rear extension with roof windows, loft conversion with front and rear dormers, hip to gable conversion and a front canopy'. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I.
4. The appellant has advised that since this appeal was submitted planning permission has been granted for the proposed single storey rear extension and front canopy. Be that as it may, I note the Council has raised no concerns with those elements of the proposal thus I have determined this appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

5. The effect of the proposed hip to gable roof extension and front dormer on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling fronting Hanover Gardens, which is predominantly characterised by pairs of semi-detached dwellings that are symmetrically designed with hipped roofs. Whilst various roof alterations have been carried out to some properties, their hipped roofs, which continue down below the eaves line above the front door, remain a prominent characteristic that creates a strong sense of uniformity in the street scene and a sense of space between the pairs.

7. The proposed hip to gable extension would project beyond the dwelling's two storey side elevation, thus entirely removing the characteristic cat slide roof over the front door. This introduction of substantial massing to the roof, combined with the scale and siting of the proposed front dormer, would completely dominate its roof thus significantly altering the characteristic design of the dwelling.
8. Furthermore, the hip to gable extension would erode the sense of space between the appeal dwelling and the adjacent pair of properties and, due to their combined scale, bulk and positioning, both the front dormer and gable extension, when taken together, would appear as top-heavy additions. These alterations would be readily apparent from Hanover Gardens and read as displeasing and visually incongruous features that would be at odds with the predominant characteristics of the properties in the street.
9. The attached property at No 8 Hanover Gardens has undergone a hip to gable roof extension which I acknowledge has somewhat unbalanced the host pair and altered the design of the roof. Nevertheless, I note that this example does not include a front dormer and the existing cat slide roof over the front door remains, whereas this would be lost in the appeal proposal. As such, I consider this example to be a less intrusive addition than the proposal before me.
10. I note there are other properties along Hanover Gardens which have side and/or front dormers. However, due to their siting and design the characteristic hipped roof form of the host dwellings remains prominent. Therefore, they do not serve to justify the appeal proposal.
11. The appellant has advised that planning permission has recently been granted for various works to No 13 Hanover Gardens, including a front dormer and hip to gable extension. I do not know the full circumstances of that approval and cannot determine whether it is directly comparable to this appeal based on the very limited detail before me. Similarly, I have not been provided with the exact details of the roof alterations currently ongoing at No 2 Hanover Gardens. As such, I afford these matters limited weight.
12. Consequently, taking all the above into consideration, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. It would therefore conflict with policies DES 1 and DES 8 of the City of Salford Unitary Development Plan which seek to ensure that extensions respect the scale, character and proportions of the original building and have regard to and complement the character of the street, amongst other things.

Other Matter

13. I acknowledge that the Council is considering designating Hanover Gardens a Conservation Area. However, this has not been a determinative factor in the consideration of this appeal as I have based my recommendation solely on the character of the properties and the locality at the time of my site visit.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. There are no material considerations, including the letter of support, that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

H Ellison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR