



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2023

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 April 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/23/3314056

11 Brogden Terrace, Sale M33 7UF

- 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 Liz Clough against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref 108031/HHA/22, dated 6 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of a proposed single storey rear extension, dropped kerb/driveway to front garden and installation of conservation rooflights to existing loft room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a proposed single storey rear extension, dropped kerb/driveway to front garden and installation of conservation rooflights to existing loft room at 11 Brogden Terrace, Sale M33 7UF in accordance with the terms of the application, 108031/HHA/22, dated 6 June 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following 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: Existing Elevations; Existing Plans – drawing ref. 22-24-20-001-R2; Proposed Elevations – drawing ref. 22-24-20-002-R2; and Proposed Plans – drawing ref. 22-24-20-001-R6.
 - 3) Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application no above ground construction works shall take place until details of all materials to be used externally on the building and drive have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The property lies within the Brogden Grove Conservation Area. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a duty on decision makers with respect to any buildings or land within a conservation area, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

3. Accordingly, the main issue in this case is whether or not the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Brogden Grove Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The Brogden Grove Conservation Area (the CA) is small, its boundary drawn around the T-shaped residential streets of Brogden Terrace and Brogden Grove and including those dwellings fronting Marsland Road. The *Brogden Grove Conservation Area – Supplementary Planning Document (2016)* (SPD5.14) describes the significance of the CA as derived in part from its historic association with the development of the Altrincham railway which saw wealth disseminate into Manchester's suburbs. Brogden Terrace is also recognised in SPD5.14 as having a particular architectural value for its symmetry and rich detailing with stock brick accents.
5. Within that context, No.11 Brogden Terrace (No.11) is a well presented three-storey mid terrace dwelling constructed of brick with a pitched slate roof, set behind a front garden. It makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and to the significance of the CA as a heritage asset.
6. To the rear of the terrace, access to small yards is from a cobbled ginnel and these have largely been retained in their historic form. The Map Progression in SPD5.14 shows that the dwellings would have originally been built with a rear outrigger. The proposal would involve the removal of this outrigger and the construction of a single storey extension which would extend the width of the rear elevation and project around 4.5m, broadly in line with the extensions either side to Nos.10 and 12 Brogden Terrace.
7. I observed from the ginnel that the rear elevation of the terrace has been altered and several single storey additions of various depths and design have replaced the original outriggers and plan form. There is not therefore any particular uniformity or symmetry to the rear, an important characteristic of the principal elevation of Brogden Terrace, and it is an elevation I find could accommodate sensitive change.
8. The proposed extension would have a shallow, dual pitched roof similar to the neighbour at No.12, with crittal style patio doors to the retained rear yard. Whilst not classical in its architectural style, the simple design of the extension would be sympathetic to the appearance of the rear elevation of No.11 and wider terrace, with only the roof profile above the eaves visible from the ginnel. The patio doors, whilst not matching the fenestration of the original dwelling, would not be inappropriate in a new part of the dwelling ensuring it is read as a later addition.
9. To the front, it is proposed to replace part of the existing front garden and the low stone boundary upstand with an area of block paving to provide off-street car parking. SPD5.14 explains that the pressure for car parking spaces has resulted in the removal of boundary walls to many of the properties which has resulted in the loss of greenspace and the original strong sense of unity to property boundaries. Consistent with this, I saw on my site visit that many other dwellings on Brogden Terrace and Brogden Grove have areas of paved car parking to the front, or in respect of the end terraces, to the side. These typically have retained an area of lawn or landscaping close to the front of the dwelling and boundary treatments are a mixture of stone upstands, low timber

fencing or hedges. Whilst I recognise that Policy 17 of the *Brogden Grove Conservation Area: Supplementary Planning Document (2016)* (SPD5.14a) seeks to retain original boundary walls bordering the pavement, the proposed driveway would not be at odds with the existing character. The loss of some landscaping should also be balanced with the removal of on-street parking which I found would itself have a positive impact on the appearance of the Brogden Terrace.

10. Accordingly, whilst the proposal would change the appearance and plan form of the dwelling, I am satisfied that it would not adversely affect the architectural value of the dwelling, or wider terrace, or the contribution it makes to the CA. In reaching this conclusion I have had regard to SPD5.14 and 14a and *Supplementary Planning Document SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (2012)*. The proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA and therefore complies with the statutory duty as set out above.
11. Furthermore, the proposal would accord with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which requires that great weight should be given to a heritage asset's conservation. Given that I have found no harm to the conservation area, it is not necessary to balance any harm against public benefits as set out in paragraph 202. For the same reasons the proposal would comply with Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan, Core Strategy (2012) which seeks to ensure amongst other things that development is appropriate to its context.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit for implementation of the planning permission, it is necessary to impose a condition specifying the approved plans to provide certainty. The proposed plans and planning application form provide limited details in respect of the proposed materials and therefore, in the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the CA, a condition is imposed requiring details of materials to be submitted and approved. I have, however, amended this condition such that it only requires details (rather than samples) of materials to be submitted, and includes the materials to be used for the block paved drive.
13. I do not find it necessary, or reasonable, for a full landscaping scheme to be submitted for a householder application of this type. The landscaping condition as suggested by the Council, has therefore been omitted.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR