



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2024

by Alison Hartley, LLB(Hons), Solicitor, MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/23/3330953
56 Braemar Drive, Sale, M33 4NJ

- 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 Mrs Emily McKiernan against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 110196/HHA/23, dated 3 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2023.
 - The proposed development is "existing roof removed and replaced with new gable end roof raised to create additional bedrooms with a dormer to the rear."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Issues

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been updated since the parties' appeal submissions have been made. However, as the revisions do not affect the matters under consideration in this appeal, it was not considered necessary to seek further comment.
3. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. The revised wording clearly describes the proposal set out in the plans. Accordingly, the following description as set out in the LPA Notice of Decision and the Appeal Form is used in this decision:

"Alterations to roof shape from hip to gable ends and raising roof ridge height with new rear dormer to accommodate loft conversion."

As the LPA Notice of Decision also uses the revised wording stated on the appeal form, it was not considered necessary to seek further comment.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal building is a detached hipped roofed dwelling set within a street-scene of predominantly semi-detached two-storey properties. Braemar Drive is characterised by relatively uniform buildings in terms of scale, height and appearance. The buildings benefit from regular gaps between them creating a rhythm and sense of spaciousness along the street.
6. Although the appeal building differs in design from the majority of the dwellings in Braemar Drive, it is considered that the current height and hipped style of the roofline contributes to the uniformity of the roofscape - an established characteristic of the street-scene.
7. By raising the roof height and altering the roof contour to the extent proposed it is considered that the established roofscape character in Braemar Drive would be disrupted such that the building would appear incongruous and overly dominant in the street scene. It is also considered that the proposal would unbalance the design of the existing property by being top heavy and overly dominant. The proposal would consequently be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing property and the surrounding area by virtue of its scale, height, massing, design and positioning.
8. Having regard to the above, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy (January 2012) (LP) which requires proposals to enhance the street scene or character of the area and be appropriate in their context. Trafford Borough Council Supplementary Planning Document 4 – A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (February 2012) (SPD4) is a material consideration. SPD4 promotes careful design of extensions that should maintain and reinforce the design of the main dwelling and help an extension to blend in with the street-scene. It states that extensions that dominate the original house or appear over-dominant in the surrounding area will not be acceptable. Framework paragraph 139 is relevant and states that development that is not well designed, particularly where it fails to reflect local design guides should be refused.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons I find that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that outweigh the harm caused by the proposal. The appeal should be dismissed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR