
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2022

by A Veevers BA(Hons), PGDip(BCon), MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/22/3299206

27 Ollerbarrow Road, Hale WA15 9PP

- 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 and Mrs Roots against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 106837/HHA/22, dated 31 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'structure to side elevation to provide a covered area for electric vehicle charging point. Proposed new pitched roof to existing garage.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house located within Character Zone B of the South Hale Conservation Area (CA). The significance of the CA is derived, in part, from its spacious residential nature incorporating architecturally high-quality buildings. The Appraisal SPD¹ comments that architectural styles and plot sizes within the area vary and most properties are bound by low stone walls, hedges and trees which provides a unified semi-rural character. Views through the gaps between properties and landscaping behind add to the spaciousness and verdancy of the area and form part of its intrinsic character.
4. Along Ollerbarrow Road, the Appraisal SPD notes there are numerous semi-detached properties dating to the Edwardian Period with a high level of architectural detail and there are key views in both directions along the road. Since 27 Ollerbarrow Road (No.27) shares these features, it is identified within the Appraisal as a positive contributor to the character and appearance of the CA. I have had regard to the duty to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
5. Although the proposed side extension would be set back a brick length from the main front wall of the house, it nonetheless would sit much further forward

¹ South Hale Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document Conservation Area Appraisal (SPD5.21)(2017)

towards the street than the existing car port at No.25 which has already reduced the space between it and the appeal property. The presence of an additional structure would fill the gap between the properties and result in notable harm to the appearance of the CA. This harm would be further emphasised through the siting of the extension close to the front corner of the house and adjacent to the mature tree along the boundary with No.25, rather than behind it. The effect of eroding the space around dwellings is identified as harmful to the character of the CA in the Management Plan SPD².

6. The front elevation of No.27 includes some fine architectural detailing. The proposed extension is single storey and a largely open structure. However, due to its position on the front corner of the house, the height of the mono pitch roof above the feature course and use of a timber board gable, it would be at odds with the architectural merits of the host building. The position and design of the extension would dilute the positive contribution the building makes to the CA. This conflicts with guidance contained in the House Extension SPD³ which seeks to ensure extensions are not out of character with the original style and scale of dwelling. Whilst the proposed extension would be set back by one brick from the front corner as advocated in the House Extension SPD, it would be clearly visible and prominent in the street and detract from its spacious character.
7. My attention has been drawn by the appellant, to several existing side extensions and garages along Ollerbarrow Road. However, many of these are set back further from front elevations and those that are not, are of different styles or gable materials to that proposed and do not represent the predominant character of the area, which is one of verdant spaciousness. Therefore, they are materially different to the scheme before me.
8. In addition to the proposed side extension, it is proposed to replace a flat roof on the existing detached garage at the property with a pitched roof. This part of the proposal would have a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the CA due to its considerable set back from the street.
9. The proposed side extension would have a negative effect on the significance of a designated heritage asset and would result in "less than substantial" harm in the context of paragraph 202 of the Framework. The harm would need to be weighed against the public benefits. In this case, the lack of harm to the tree between No.27 and No.25 is regarded as neutral as is the change to the garage roof. The benefits are private, relating to the appellants' need for a covered area close to an electric vehicle charging point on the property. As such, the public benefits do not outweigh the identified material harm to the designated heritage asset.
10. On the above basis, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the South Hale Conservation Area. The proposed development would be contrary to the heritage protection policies of the Framework. It would conflict with the design aims of Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) as well as the House Extension SPD and the

² South Hale Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document Conservation Area Management Plan (SPD5.21a)(2017)

³ Supplementary Planning Document: A Guide for Designing House Extensions & Alterations (SPD4)(2012)

Appraisal and Management Plan SPD's which seek to preserve and enhance the historic environment.

Conclusion

11. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no other considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Veervers

INSPECTOR