



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2024

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/24/3344606

6 Ashmeade, Hale Barns, Altrincham WA15 0DB

- 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 & Mrs Krishna & Neelima Venigalla & Boppana against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref: 112752/HHA/24 dated 29 January 2024 was refused by notice dated 25 March 2024.
 - The application is for single storey front extension including front porch, two storey rear extension, first floor side extension and garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area and the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of neighbours.

Reasons

3. Ashmeade is a suburban cul de sac that contains relatively sizeable houses of similar and generally consistent architectural styles and materials. The design of the street is therefore of a quality that sets it apart from other such developments of a similar age. The street is generally open plan in character with well kept grass verges lining the road and generally open plan gardens abutting.
4. Although styles of houses differ, they all maintain a consistency of design in both their materials, forms and architectural elaboration. For instance strong gable forms are common as are intentionally ancillary looking garage blocks that are obviously intended to integrate as such. I consider that this consistency of design, perhaps more than any other, contributes to the strong character and sense of place here.
5. The appeal property itself presents one such gable fronting its open plan front garden. The form of the house is a T-shape in plan with a main range effectively side on to the street and a link attached porch and garage of a pitched roof single storey appearance to the side. To the rear the gable continues through and has seemingly been added to with a glazed shallow pitched roof conservatory type extension.

6. The proposal before me seeks permission to extend over the existing bedroom 4, which is located to the ground floor behind the garages. This would extend a gable in a southerly direction so as to create an extra two en suite bedrooms to the first floor of the extension. This element of the proposal would be set well back from the front elevation over the existing garages but would protrude slightly with a smaller, pitched roof gable that would sit above the lean too roof of the ground floor. The garages would also be converted and slightly extended forward so as to create a playroom/gym space and a new window would be inserted in place of the garage doors.
7. To the front the existing front lawn area would be reduced by around 4.4m in favour of a new parking space laid in permeable surfacing and space for a path would be maintained to reach a new pitched roof porch. In terms of materials the majority of the extension would be proposed to match the existing dark red brick, but to the rear this would be proposed to be rendered in a light colour render.
8. In assessing this proposal, I am aware of the Council's Places for Everyone Plan (PEP), the Trafford Core Strategy (CS) and the Revised Unitary Development Plan (UDP) that reflect the approach in the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) in the importance that they give to high quality design that is responsive and reflective of context.
9. In this case, the proposal would considerably enlarge the appearance of this house through both the extent of the southern extension over the entire width of the plot and the erosion of the existing articulation and landscaping that the site currently possesses. Through this loss of articulation, the cleverly designed combination of gables, and ancillary spaces and roof forms within and around this building would be lost. This would be noticeable through both the width of the extension as well as the loss of the garage element which would result in a watering down of the prominent main gable of the house itself as well as the loss of the ancillary gable offered by the garages themselves.
10. Although the porch extension would offer some compensation in this respect, the loss of more front lawn area and the widening of car parking and hardstanding would also result in an erosion of one of the more fundamental elements of character that defines Ashmeade, that of front gardens and landscaping. As a result, the frontage of this plot would be dominated by vehicles to the detriment of the character of the street here.
11. In terms of the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of those at number 4 Ashmeade, the two properties face in a northerly direction and number 6 protrudes some distance in front of number 4. Number 4 contains two front windows to the nearest area of the house adjacent to the boundary and this boundary is demarked by a relatively high hedge.
12. The proposal would bring a two storey element of building closer to this boundary. Although there may be some effect of indirect dominance upon these two frontage windows this would be only relate to the dominance of an element of building that would sit above the existing hedge. Although not greatly impactful I consider that the living conditions within these rooms could well still be harmed through this scheme being located so close and high alongside the boundary here. As such, in this respect I consider that Policy L7 of the CS is compromised and that the proposal, on balance, would be contrary

to the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on house extensions¹.

13. In summary I consider that proposal before me would erode some important elements of this property and the streetscene within which it sits. Although I consider that there are means to extend this property that would alleviate or remove such harm, the proposal before me would fail to meet the policy requirements as contained within Policy JP-01 of the PEP, Policy L7 of the CS or the guidance contained within the SPD and the emphasis upon the importance of good design as related within The Framework. As such the appeal must fail.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR

¹ Supplementary Planning Document 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations, February 2012.