



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2024

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/24/3344689

6a Groby Place, Altrincham WA14 4AL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Jon Drape against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref is 111923/HHA/23.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of single storey extension at 6a Groby Place, Altrincham WA14 4AL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 111923/HHA/23, 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: 0277_00_202 – Existing Elevations; 0277_00_200 – Existing Plans; 0277_00_201 – Existing Sections; 0277_00_100 – Existing Site Plan; 0277_20_202 – Proposed elevations; 0277_80_250 – Proposed External 3D View; 0277_80_250 – Proposed Plans; 0277_20_201 – Proposed Sections; and 0277_20_100 – Proposed Site Plan.
 - 3) No development involving the use of materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building (including rainwater goods and joinery details of windows and doors) hereby permitted shall take place until details of the materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE) was adopted on 21 March 2024 by nine Greater Manchester authorities, including Trafford Council. PfE Policy JP-P1 and JP-P2 replace parts of policies L7 and R1 of the Trafford Core Strategy (2012) (CS) referred to the Council's decision notice, in so far as they relate to design quality and the historic environment. PfE Policy JP-P1 and JP-P2 were, however, also referred to in the Council's decision notice, and

therefore 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 proposed single storey extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and on the Old Market Place Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. No.6a Groby Place (No.6a) is a semi-detached dwelling located on the north-east side of Groby Place, a residential road off Dunham Road. The north-east side of Groby Place falls within the boundary of the Old Market Place Conservation Area (CA). As such, I have a statutory duty under section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.
5. The *Conservation Area Appraisal (2014)* (CAA) identifies that the special interest of the CA is derived, in part, from the numerous buildings which are C19 or earlier, retain a variety of historic architectural detailing and traditional materials (including brick, slate, sandstone and painted joinery), giving a high level of aesthetic value, visual harmony and a sense of historic character. No.6a is identified in the CAA as being a positive contributor to the CA, and there is no dispute between the parties that it is a non-designated heritage asset. No.6a is constructed in a light, buff coloured brick, with a symmetrical composition (to the original Villa), advanced gable to the outer bay with a ground floor canted bay window. It is an attractive mid C19 residential Villa, set back behind a generous front garden, and I agree that, together with its attached pair (at No.7 Groby Place), it makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
6. To the side, No.6a has been extended to accommodate a double garage, with a shallow pitched roof and facing gable, providing accommodation in the roofspace. An existing raised decked area and stairs would be removed and to the rear of the garage extension a single storey extension is proposed which would project around 4.3m in depth.
7. The proposed extension would result in loss of part of the rear garden of No.6a effectively between the rear elevation of the existing garage extension and the existing raised decking area (at its deepest point), which the appellant has assessed as only around 6.3% of the overall plot. There would inevitably be a loss of a lawned area, but the proposed extension would be offset from the south-east boundary of No.6a, allowing the existing boundary hedgerow to be retained. I observed on site that the rear garden of No.6a is modest (for a dwelling of its size) and the proposed extension would reduce the depth of the garden further, to around 6.2m. I concur with the appellant, however, that No.6a benefits from a generous front garden and the spaciousness of the plot, and appreciation of the setting of the Villa, is derived from this rather than the rear garden.
8. The extension would be set in from the edge of the garage by around 1.25m (to allow access) and would extend around 14m across the rear elevation, up to the original two-storey gabled outrigger. The proposed extension would be

- set back from the rear elevation of the outrigger, but I accept that the juncture of the flat roof means an historic window opening and sash window would be largely obscured. The shallow pitched roof of the garage extension would be retained and the proposed extension would sit below the eaves level, around 2.7m in height. Despite extending more than half the width of its host, the modest height means it would not appear a disproportionate addition, particularly given the height of the eaves of the original Villa (on the rear elevation) is over 8m.
9. It is accepted that the rear elevation of the original Villa has a strong vertical emphasis which it derives from its three bays, central two-storey outrigger, and broadly symmetrical fenestration. The existing garage extension, however, already gives the dwelling a strong horizontal element and by terminating at the two-storey outrigger (and set back from it) the proposed extension would not significantly alter the balance or composition of the rear elevation.
 10. The proposed extension would be very contemporary in design with a black steel frame, flat roof with spherically glazed sky lights, and floor to ceiling revolving glass windows. Whilst I acknowledge that the architectural detailing and materials (notably the light, buff brickwork) contributes to the significance of the Villa, the very contemporary design of the proposed extension would 'read' as an honest addition; enabling the original Villa to be appreciated. Although the steel canopy framing to the side and across the parapet of the flat roof would have a solid, structural appearance, the use of extensive full height glazing (with minimal glazing bars) means the proposed extension would appear relatively 'light weight' and would not dominate the rear elevation of its host. I do not therefore find it would cause harm to the character or appearance of No.6a, rather it would appear a well-designed, sympathetic addition.
 11. No.6a is identified in the CAA as located within Character Zone E: Southern Residential Area, characterised by residential properties of typically mid to late C19 and C20 constructed around Dunham Road. The CAA describes No.6a's interest as being a mid C19 semi-detached Villa which is illustrative of residential development being undertaken in this part of Altrincham at the time, with its scale, detailing, form and position offering evidence as to the high status of the property.
 12. Policy 47 of the *Conservation Area Management Plan (2016)* (CAMP) states that single storey extensions may be acceptable subject to their proposed size, scale, design and materials. Any proposed extensions should be high quality in design and materials and in keeping with the character of the property and surrounding historic rear elevations. For the reasons already given, the proposed extension would be a high quality design, of a size and scale that would not cause harm to the rear elevation of its host. It would not be visible from Groby Place, nor would it be viewed in the context of surrounding historic elevations. I accept that traditional detailing and the consistent use of traditional materials contributes to the significance of the CA, giving the area a sense of visual harmony. However, in this case, for the reasons above, I find the contemporary design and materials appropriate and there would be no conflict with CAMP Policy 47.
 13. No.6a would retain its high level of architectural detail and historic character and continue to make a positive contribution to the CA. I therefore conclude on

the main issue that the proposed extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the Old Market Place Conservation Area. Consequently, it accords with PfE Policy JP-P1 because it is distinctive, with a clear identity, would conserve the historic environment and respect and acknowledge the identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, scale and materials. Further, it would comply with PfE Policy JP-P2 and CS Policy R1 which, together, require development to consider heritage significance in accordance with national policy and preserve and enhance conservation areas, in light of relevant supplementary planning documents (in this case the CAMP).

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard time condition limiting the lifespan of the planning permission, I have also attached a condition specifying the approved drawings, in the interests of certainty. To ensure that high-quality materials are used, I also find it necessary, as suggested by the Council, to impose a condition requiring details of external materials, including rainwater goods and joinery details, to be submitted to, and approved by the Council.

Conclusion

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

R. Jones

INSPECTOR