



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 May 2024

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/24/3337399

49 Bankhall Lae, Hale Barns, Trafford WA15 0LF

- 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 Holmes against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application 111969/HHA/23, dated 26 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey front and rear extension. Two storey rear extension and first floor side extension. New loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Places for Everyone, Joint Development Plan Document (JDP) was adopted in March 2024, so after the Council's decision, and replaces, or partly replaces, some of the policies in the Trafford Local Plan Core Strategy (2012). This includes the part replacement of CS Policy L7, referred to in the Council's decision notice, with JDP Policy JP-P1. This policy was, however, also referenced in the decision notice and it has not therefore been necessary to seek further views of the parties on this matter.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension and alterations on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, its semi-detached pair and the wider area.

Reasons

4. No.49 Bankhall Lane (No.49) is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the north side of Bankhall Lane.
5. I observed on my site visit that this part of Bankhall Lane is characterised predominantly by substantial, detached two-storey dwellings that vary in their design and appearance, but typically have a traditional hipped or gabled roof form, are well-spaced and set within generous plots. No.49 itself is brick-built, with a hipped-roof, uncharacteristic in that it is one of a semi-detached pair of dwellings, but together they read largely as a single, wide property within the streetscene.

6. To the side, No.49 has an attached garage with a steep pitched roof that extends up to the eaves of the main roof and projects very close to the side boundary, shared with No.51 Bankhall Lane (No.51). It is proposed to extend at first floor over the existing garage projecting around 6m from the existing flank elevation of the host dwelling. By extending the full width of the garage, the first floor would be offset only 0.5m from this side boundary, however, No.51 itself is well offset from the boundary so the characteristic spacing between properties would remain.
7. The proposed extension would alter the existing roof form from a hip to a gable, continuing the existing ridge and eaves of the host roof. The first floor would not be set back from the front elevation and, consequently, combined with the ridge line, it would fail to appear a subordinate or subservient addition to its host. The gable roof form would significantly increase the mass of the dwelling, right up its edge, unbalancing the composition of the semi-detached pair. The hedgerow on the Bankhall Lane frontage of No.51 is relatively high, but the proposed large flank gable would nonetheless be imposing and unduly prominent from the east, close to the junction of Wyngate Road. To the rear, beyond the original roof form, the first floor side extension would have a flat roof that would align with the eaves of the proposed gable. This too would be visible from Bankhall Lane and would appear incongruous in the context of the characteristic traditional roof forms described.
8. On the rear roof slope of the new gable a dormer window is proposed which would extend over half the width of the roof (as extended). The guidance in the Council's *Supplementary Planning Document 4: A Guide to Designing House Extensions and Alterations (2012) (SPD4)* is that dormer windows should not sit above the ridge of the existing dwelling, appear dominant or top heavy due to siting or design or sit too close to the edges of the main roof. In this case, the proposed dormer aligns with the ridge of the host roof but extends very close to one edge and is only slightly offset from the eaves. Because of this, the proposed dormer would appear unduly prominent and its zinc clad cheek would be visible from Bankhall Lane, adding to the overall prominence and massing of the proposed gable.
9. The dormer would have full height doors with a Juliette balcony which would be taller than other windows on the rear elevation. However, the rear elevation has no clear, or defining, window hierarchy and I therefore find no conflict with SPD4 in so far as it requires the style and proportions of dormer windows to match the windows below, and as far as possible to be vertically aligned.
10. To the rear, a part single, part two storey extension is proposed; the latter effectively infilling a small space between the existing garage and utility. The Council have raised no concerns regarding the scale and proportions of these, and I have no reason to disagree. I also find the flat roof of the single storey extension, set on the boundary with the attached neighbour (so well within the plot), acceptable and not uncommon for modest rear extensions. For the reasons given above, however, the flat roof of the first floor on the side and rear elevation, would appear at odds with the prevailing character of roof forms and would contribute to the harmful massing of the proposed gable.
11. No.49 has an existing part brick, part glazed porch with a pitched roof which continues across the frontage of its attached neighbour at No.47 Bankhall Lane (No.47). Although No.47 has a gable porch that projects forward of this pitched

roof, there is nonetheless a cohesive (albeit not symmetrical) composition to the front elevation of the pair. The existing porch is proposed to be replaced with a part open, flat roof porch, with an arch detail, which would have a stepped projection from the front elevation of No.49. Whilst only projecting 2.2m from the front elevation, I find the flat roof of the porch would appear an unsympathetic and discordant addition to the semi-detached pair. Further, whilst I recognise that render and contemporary detailing is not uncharacteristic of the wider area, in this case, the proposed white render finish to the whole dwelling would starkly contrast and be out of character with No.47, to the detriment of the semi-detached pair and wider area.

12. The appellant has drawn my attention to a planning permission for extensions and alterations to No.49 approved by the Council in October 2021 (ref. 105048/HHA/21). That proposal is, however, quite different to the one now before me and does not raise the harm that I have found. Notably: the proposed first floor side extension had a hipped roof, set well down from the ridge of the host roof; it retained the existing pitched roof to the porch; did not include a dormer within the rear roofslope; and retained elements of the original brickwork.
13. For the reasons given, I conclude on the main issue that the proposed extension and alterations would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, semi-detached pair and wider area. Consequently, in addition to the conflict with SPD4, the proposals would conflict with JDP Policy JP-P1 (2024) because it does not respect and acknowledge the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, scale and size. It would also fail to accord with the principles of good design in Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

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

R Jones

INSPECTOR