



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2024

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/W/24/3340080

12 Basford Road, Trafford M16 0GE

- 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 Kashif Ali against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application 112362/HHA/23, dated 22 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2024.
 - The development proposed is retrospective application for the erection of side and rear extension. Extension of front porch, compound wall and front elevation rendering.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the front porch and compound wall. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the erection of side and rear extension and front elevation rendering and planning permission is granted for the erection of side and rear extension and front elevation rendering at 12 Basford Road, Trafford M16 0GE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 112362/HHA/23, dated 22 November 2023, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Block Plan – drawing ref. DR-05, dated 05-10-23; and As Built Building Plans and Elevations – drawing ref. DR-03, dated 05-10-2023.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE) was adopted in March 2024. PfE Policy JP-P1 replaces Policy L7.1 (design quality) of the Trafford Core Strategy (2012) (CS) referred to the Council's decision notice. As PfE Policy JP-P1 is also referred to in the Council's decision notice, it has not been necessary to seek further views from the parties on this matter.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the two-storey side and rear extension, porch extension and compound wall on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider streetscene.

Reasons

4. No.12 Basford Road (No.12) is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the north-west corner of Basford Road and Henley Avenue.

5. To the side and rear, No.12 has been extended over two-storeys, constructed in brick with a grey tiled hipped roof. The Council granted planning permission (ref. 100996/HHA/20) for a similar side and rear extension in November 2020. The Approved Plans and Elevations (drawing no. 05-10-2023) submitted with the planning application show the principal differences between the earlier planning permission and the appeal proposal as: the alignment of the front elevation of the side extension; the ridge height of the new roof; the number, location and design of windows; and the scale and design of the front porch.
6. I observed on my site visit that the west side of Basford Road is characterised by semi-detached pairs of two-storey dwellings, similar in design, with hipped roof forms, single ground and first floor bay windows and finished in brick and render. There are, however, examples – notably No.16 and No.18 Basford Road – where dwellings have been altered and extended, including with contemporary detailing, and there is therefore some variety in the streetscene. I also observed that the side and rear extension to No.12 is very prominent on the corner of Basford Road and Henley Avenue, particularly travelling south to north on Basford Road.
7. The side and rear extension has a hipped roof that continues the eaves and ridgeline of its host on the front elevation and then returns the corner at the same height. This contrasts with the earlier planning permission where the ridge of the new hipped roof was marginally set down. I accept that such a set down reduces the massing of the roof form, but in this case it is the massing of the flank elevation, resulting from its depth along the Henley Avenue frontage and height to eaves, that is most prominent in the streetscene. This was found previously acceptable by the Council and I do not find the marginally higher ridgeline along the length of the extension would materially alter the appearance, or prominence of No.12's flank elevation.
8. The guidance in the Council's *SPD4: A Guide to Designing House Extensions and Alterations (2012)* is that extensions to semi-detached properties should not be excessively wide, match and complement the original dwelling, be ideally set back from the front elevation and not dominate the dwelling to detract from the original character. The side extension has been constructed in brick, contrasting to its host which has been rendered, and it continues the front elevation, rather than being offset from it. The brick differentiates the extension from the existing dwelling, but I accept that the lack of offset from the front elevation and set down from the ridgeline means that the extension fails to appear subservient to its host. There is clearly, therefore, some conflict with the SPD guidance.
9. The offset from the front elevation would, however, only be appreciated in close proximity to No.12 and I am not persuaded that when travelling in either direction, the minimal offset previously found acceptable by the Council would be distinguishable from the appeal proposal before me. Nor do I find the combination of brick and render incongruous given this is a characteristic of the wider area. On balance, I conclude that the side and rear extension would not cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, or wider streetscene.
10. The front porch has been designed with an oversailing flat roof supported by two columns which projects a reasonable distance from the front elevation of No.12. It has large glazing panels to either side and a front door with glazed

surround. Whilst I observed that other dwellings on Basford Road benefit from porch extensions (including with reasonably contemporary detailing) they are more modest in scale and have retained a traditional pitched roof, which assimilates well with the gable above the original first floor bay. In contrast, I found the scale of the porch to be disproportionate to No.12 and the design, particularly the flat roof, incongruous in the context of the wider streetscene.

11. Similarly, although boundary treatments along Basford Road vary, they typically comprise a combination of low, red brick walls with railings or hedges that are modest in scale and appearance. The original low red brick wall and hedge has been removed and replaced with a block wall (which is higher than the wall of its attached neighbour) and a series of block columns, proposed to be finished in render (painted white) with horizontal black steel railings between. The boundary wall extends across the Bashford Road frontage of No.12 and returns most of the Henley Avenue frontage. It is therefore particularly prominent and its scale and design would appear unsympathetic and visually intrusive in the streetscene.
12. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the side and rear extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider streetscene. Consequently, in this regard, the proposal would not conflict with PfE Policy JP-P1 because it respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used. However, for the reasons given, I conclude that the front porch and compound wall would cause significant harm. As the parts of the appeal (the side and rear extension and front porch and compound wall) are clearly physically and functionally severable, it is possible to issue a split decision in this case.

Conditions

13. Because the side and rear extensions have already been built, it is not necessary to impose the standard implementation condition, or a condition requiring the materials used to match those of the existing dwelling. In the interests of certainty, I have, however, imposed a condition specifying the approved drawings.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed in so far as it relates to the front porch and boundary treatment, and allowed in so far as it relates to the side and rear extension and front elevation rendering.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR