



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2021

by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/21/3279065

Oakmere, 11 Murieston Road, Hale WA15 9SU

- 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 & Mrs A Stone against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 103842/HHA/21, dated 15 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 May 2021.
 - The development was described as proposed first floor extension over existing garage, single storey rear extension to form extended kitchen / dining and new enclosed porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a front porch, single storey rear extension and a first floor extension to the existing garage at Oakmere, 11 Murieston Road, Hale WA15 9SU in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 103842/HHA/21, dated 15 March 2021, subject to the attached schedule of conditions.

Preliminary Matters

2. The development for which planning permission is sought was described on the application form as "proposed first floor extension over existing garage, single storey rear extension to form extended kitchen / dining and new enclosed porch". The Council's decision notice and the appeal form described the development as "erection of a front porch, single storey rear extension and a first floor extension to the existing garage". In the formal decision I have used this description as it is a more precise and accurate reflection of the proposed development for which permission is sought.

Main Issue

3. The Council consider the front porch and rear extension to be acceptable, and I see no reason to disagree. Thus, the main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor extension on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area, having regard to the South Hale Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. Oakmere is a two-storey, detached dwelling situated within a residential street in the CA. It reads as a more modern dwelling, with a simple appearance and contains less architectural features, than the older dwellings in Murieston Road. Nonetheless, its general design and materials are in keeping. Properties within the surrounding area vary in scale, design and siting.

5. Based on the evidence before me, this section of the CA is characterised by tree lined streets and residential dwellings which vary in architectural style, scale and massing with examples of Edwardian properties. Houses are generally set in spacious plots.
6. 9 and 13 Murieston Road, to either side of the host property, as well as 8 and 10-12, opposite the host property, are identified as positive contributors¹ towards the character of the CA. This is due to their age, character and architectural integrity. The Council highlight that these are non-designated heritage assets, this has not been disputed by the appellant. These dwellings are more substantial than Oakmere. The existing main bulk of Oakmere is set back from the frontages of Nos 9 and 13. The proposed first floor extension, above the existing garage, would be broadly level with the frontages of the neighbouring properties.
7. The proposed first floor extension would increase the scale and massing of the dwelling towards the front of the site. However, it would utilise the footprint of the existing dwelling. The roof would be stepped down from the ridge height of the main bulk of the dwelling. It would have the same ridge and eaves height, and angle, as the left-hand side front gable style roof. The design, detailing and proportions of the extension would complement that of the existing dwelling and would not detract from the main body of the property or result in an unsatisfactory appearance.
8. The extension would be visible from Murieston Road. The scale and depth of the resulting L shape would be greater than other properties with projecting gables. Nonetheless, the extension would not appear overly prominent or result in an incongruous addition. This is due to the context of the appeal site and surrounding area (which contains a variety of dwellings), trees, siting of the neighbouring dwellings as well as the siting and design of the extension which would respect the building line of the neighbouring dwellings. The use of white render would also be acceptable having regard to the context of the surrounding area which includes a mix of materials, including render.
9. The property would remain subservient and respect the character and appearance of the non-designated heritage assets because of the height, scale and massing of the neighbouring dwellings and the siting and scale of the extension. For the above reasons, I am satisfied that the scheme would preserve the character and appearance of the CA and would have a neutral impact on the non-designated heritage assets.
10. Accordingly, the proposed development would not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. Consequently, it would comply with Policies R1 and L7 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012). These policies seek, amongst other matters, to promote high quality design by ensuring development is appropriate in its context and preserve or enhance conservation areas.
11. It would also not conflict with chapters 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires new development to be sympathetic to local character and seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment. Similarly, it would not conflict with the South Hale Conservation Area

¹ Appendix 1 of the South Hale Conservation Area Appraisal – Supplementary Planning Document SPD5.21 (2017)

Management Plan – Supplementary Planning Document SPD5.21a (2017) and the Council’s SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (2012). These seek to preserve and enhance the CA’s character, appearance, and special architectural, historic and spatial interest and to ensure that extensions are compatible with and are not harmful to local character.

Other Matters

12. I have considered the comments received by a neighbour, including concerns relating to overlooking. There is a limited gap between the proposed first floor, east facing, windows and the side facing windows of Gatesgarth. The new windows can be conditioned to ensure that they are fitted with obscure glazing to ensure that they would not overlook Gatesgarth. The Council considered the scheme to be acceptable in this regard, subject to a planning condition, and I see no reason to disagree.

Conditions

13. I have assessed the Council’s suggested conditions in light of guidance found in the Planning Practice Guidance and where necessary the wording has been amended for clarity and precision.
14. It is necessary to attach a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. The Council requested a condition requiring samples and full specification of materials to be used externally. Based on the evidence submitted, the submitted plans contain sufficient information in this regard and therefore I have attached a condition to ensure that the proposed materials detailed on the plans are implemented. This condition is necessary in order to preserve the character and appearance of the area, including the CA. In the interest of safeguarding living conditions of the occupiers of Gatesgarth, a condition relating to obscure glazing is also necessary.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed subject to the attached conditions.

L M Wilson

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF 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: 2037/1 (EXISTING PLANS, LOCATION PLAN & BLOCK PLAN), 2037/03 (PROPOSED PLANS), 2037/04 (PROPOSED ROOF PLAN & NORTH & SOUTH ELEVATIONS) and 2037/05 (WEST & EAST ELEVATIONS).
- 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plans 2037/03 (PROPOSED PLANS), 2037/04 (PROPOSED ROOF PLAN & NORTH & SOUTH ELEVATIONS) and 2037/05 (WEST & EAST ELEVATIONS).
- 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the first floor windows on the side elevation facing east (towards Gatesgarth) have been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of those windows that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the windows are installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.