



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2022

by R Hitchcock BSc(Hons) DipCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/22/3302825

Dunkeld, 15 Leicester Road, Hale WA15 9QA

- 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 Gary Brown against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref 106549/HHA/21, dated 26 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2022.
- The development proposed is 'New build rear extension to existing residential property, including additional internal amendments, external fenestration alterations, proposed rear roof dormers and the relocation of the front entrance porch.'

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description appearing in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form. This was later changed to 'Erection of single storey rear and side extensions, including internal alterations, external fenestration alterations, proposed rear and side roof dormers with altered gable, alterations to front elevation to create new front entrance and porch, landscaping works and changes to front boundary entrances', which provides a more complete description of the proposed development.
3. During the course of the Council's consideration of the planning application, the appellant provided amended plans showing alternative proposals relating to fenestration, hardstandings, boundary treatments and landscaping for their consideration. The Council subsequently made its decision on the amended plans, and I shall do the same.
4. For the avoidance of doubt the relevant plans are: Site plan (01) 000-RevB, Demolition Plan (20)001-Rev D, Demo Elevations 01 (20)100-Rev D, Demo Elevations 02 (20)101- Rev D, Roof Demo Plan (20)002-Rev D, Proposed Elevations 01 & 02 (05)001-Rev G, Proposed Elevations 03 & 04 (05)002-Rev G, Proposed Plans (04)001-Rev J, Proposed Roof Plan (04)002-Rev G, Proposed Sections AA & BB (06)001-Rev F, Proposed Sections CC (06)002-Rev E, Sections L-5000, Pedestrian and Vehicular Gate Elevations L-5001, General Arrangement L-1000 Rev 3, Softworks L-3000, Proposed and Existing Hard Landscape Comparison L-1001 Rev 3 and Lighting Strategy 7000.
5. There is no dispute between the main parties that Policy R1 of the Trafford Core Strategy [2012] is out of date insofar as it does not include the balancing exercise of any identified harm to heritage assets against the public benefits of the proposal as detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework (the

Framework). Although its principle of protecting or enhancing heritage assets is similar to the aims of the Framework and therefore is entitled to some weight, in accordance with Paragraph 219 of the Framework, the more recent balancing provisions of the Framework prevail.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether or not the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the host dwelling and the South Hale Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

7. The site features a large detached dwelling with a later garage set behind a mature landscaped front garden with private amenity space to the rear. The house is 2½ storeys, probably of Edwardian age and built in a 'Tudor Revival' style. It is constructed of smooth-faced red brick with a small Rosemary roof tile. The main roof is hipped but features projecting side gables, small dormers and impressive chimney stacks. The elevations include projecting bays, hanging terracotta tiles and mock timber and plaster panels. Windows are substantially of original timber construction with fine glazing bars.
8. The site lies within the South Hale Conservation Area. The significance of the area derives from its primarily residential buildings of high-quality architectural value set in spacious plots. These originate from various periods reflecting Hale's development but retain a sense of coherence through their appearance and layout. The CA is also recognised for its pleasing verdant character derived from tree-lined streets and mature landscaping in and about individual plots.
9. The building is acknowledged as a positive contributor to the CA due to its age, style and level of architectural detailing. In accordance with the South Hale Conservation Area Management Plan, it is therefore regarded as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) by the Council.
10. The scheme would see several alterations to the dwelling, the surrounding landscaping and the front boundary. Of the proposals, there is dispute between the main parties as to the effect of a linked extension. This would be set between the detached garage and the internal angle of the L-plan form of the main house and would extend across the rear elevation.
11. The extensions consist of three elements – a flat, or low-pitched roof utility and side entrance set behind the projecting side gable; a single storey corner extension between the garage and rear side elevation with a steep-pitched vaulted roof which would be truncated to incorporate an angled rooflight; and, a new glazed canopy extension which would be open to the rear garden area.
12. The rear canopy would be formed from a side wall set in from the rear northern corner of the dwelling. This would contain a single glazed aperture and support a low sloping glazed roof. The box form, large open elevation and glazed elements would be unapologetically modern and located where they would be largely beyond the public gaze.
13. In contrast, the proposed side extensions would be visible from the street. Whilst it is somewhat unclear how the low form of the new entrance would interact with an existing hanging bay at first floor, this element would be largely set behind the projecting ground floor chimney bay of the side gable.

Utilising a low profile and recessed position, it would be a relatively innocuous addition.

14. However, despite its infill position, the large roof of the kitchen/diner extension would be conspicuous by its scale and form. As a linking structure between the house and later garage, it would appear overstated and unduly compete with the various roof elements presented by the existing buildings. Whilst the form would read as a modern addition, the degree of contrast would be somewhat undermined by the attempt to assimilate it with similar materials to those used on the existing building. Accordingly, the visual interpretation of old and new would be blurred.
15. Although it would not have a significant adverse effect on the spaciousness about the building, the scale of the roof would obscure much of the clear sky view between the garage and house. This would reduce any sense of separation, increase the bulk to the rear side of the building and give rise to a greater sense of massing. In its location, it would undermine the characteristic relationship between the principal building and the simpler detached ancillary garage. Whilst the original L-plan of the house could still be interpreted by the 2-storey building elements, I find the roof would provide little cohesion with the flanking extensions.
16. I recognise that there are examples of asymmetric roofs elsewhere in the locality. However, those roofs and turrets are often used to accentuate features to increase their degree of prominence. Similarly, the scale and contrary angles of the roof would draw focus from the main building and, in its location would serve to further confuse the appearance of what would be a single melded group of poorly integrating additional elements. The subsequent effect of the combined later additions would appear ungainly and cause a minor adverse effect on the character and appearance of the NDHA.
17. I acknowledge that the presence of some screening by mainly seasonal vegetation limits distant views, however, the visual effect of the proposed corner extension would be exacerbated by the proposed shortening of the garage. This would effectively create a clearer line of sight to the unusual roof form and angled aperture. Although the glazing would largely be reflective in the daytime, during darker hours any internal illumination would highlight the contrasting internal finishes and serve to further draw the eye to the unconventional roof form.
18. The effect on the composition of the house would undermine the recognised quality of a building which makes a positive contribution to the CA and cause a minor adverse effect on its appearance. In the context of the Framework, the extent of overall harm of the proposal would be less than substantial given the nature of the development. Paragraph 202 of the Framework advises that such harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals including securing optimal viable use. A balanced judgement is also required in relation to the effects on the NDHA.
19. Under the duty imposed under s 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the development would cause harm to the appearance of this

part of the CA. Moreover, the Framework is clear at Paragraph 199 that 'great weight should be given to the asset's conservation'.

20. The proposal would reinstate the front boundary wall to a height of 3 stone courses. This would match it with a characteristic aspect of the CA. Furthermore, the addition of a well-designed front entrance would add visual interest to the principal elevation of the house. There would also be a temporary benefit in terms of the construction phase of the development. However, those benefits would not, in my view, outweigh the identified harm.
21. I acknowledge that the proposed location of development would utilise currently underused space and limit encroachment into the open area of the rear garden to provide a focus to the outside rear amenity space, which would be enhanced. I also note that it would provide for an improved internal layout to maximise the use of the dwelling. However, these are not public benefits of the scheme and are not dependent on the specific form of the extensions proposed. They are therefore matters of negligible weight in favour of the development.
22. Taking all of the above together, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the CA and the NDHA. It would conflict with the South Hale Conservation Area – Supplementary Planning Document SPD5.21a, SPD4 -A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations [2012], Policies R1 and L7 of the Trafford Core Strategy [2012] and the provisions of the NPPF as they seek to sustain heritage assets and ensure development is appropriate in its context and enhances the character and quality of the area, including its historic interest, through matters such as appropriate scale, form, height, massing and materials.

Conclusion

23. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the building as a non-designated heritage asset and would cause harm to the appearance of the South Hale Conservation Area. It would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not be allowed.

R Hitchcock

INSPECTOR