



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 October 2024

by K Winnard Solicitor LL.B Hons

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/24/3348006

Westholme, 2 The Springs, Bowdon, Altrincham, WA14 3JH

- 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 Mr Jason Furnivall against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 112654/HHA/24.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing extension, the erection of single storey side and rear extension and alterations to the garage including new roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of an existing extension and the erection of a single storey side and rear extension and alterations to the garage including a new roof at Westholme, 2 The Springs, Bowdon, Altrincham WA14 3JH in accordance with the terms of the application 112654/HHA/24 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 plans: Location Plan 233 100 Rev P01, Proposed Site Plan 233 201 Rev P01, Proposed Plans 233 202 Rev P02, Proposed Elevations 233 211 Rev P01.
 3. Notwithstanding any description of materials in the application, no works involving the use of any materials to be used externally on the building shall take place until samples and/or full specifications of all materials (including aluminium windows/doors, sandstone cladding and timber garage door) have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the type, colour and texture of the materials. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 4. No development or works of site preparation shall take place until all trees that are to be retained within or adjacent to the site have been enclosed with temporary protective fencing in accordance with BS:5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. Recommendations'. The fencing shall be retained throughout the period of construction and no

activity prohibited by BS:5837:2012 shall take place within such protective fencing during the construction period.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council changed the description of the development and I have used this description of the development as it is a more accurate description of the development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area, having regard to its conservation area status.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, Westholme (Westholme), is a large detached property situated within the Devisdale Conservation Area (DCA) where there is a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the area. In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that great weight should be attached to the conservation of designated heritage assets, in this case the DCA.
5. The DCA is significant for its historic and architectural significance and layout characterised by distinctive large 19th century houses in a variety of architectural styles with mature gardens set back from the road. Within the DCA, Westholme is identified as a non designated heritage asset and has heritage significance in terms of its history, form and architectural detailing being of a revival architecture style known as a Bowdon villa. Given its defining characteristics, it makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the DCA. The Framework is clear that the effect on the significance of a non designated heritage asset must be taken into account when determining any planning application and that a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm and loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
6. The appeal scheme before me is a revised scheme following a previous appeal on an earlier application. The scheme would see alterations to the existing garage, including a new roof and the demolition of the existing rear/side extension and construction of a new single storey side and rear extension.
7. The existing garage has no special architectural merit to its design and the proposed alterations would be an assertive contemporary design. The Management Plan for the DCA indicated that modern design is not prohibited within the DCA provided it is of a high standard and sensitively designed to be in keeping with its surrounding historic context. The proposal would introduce a distinct horizontal form within the appeal site. However, the garage would be on the same footprint as the existing garage which is well set back within the site. The alterations would not appear unduly prominent given this set back, site levels, and the reduced height and simple roof form of the garage. The recess to the side front door would be retained. This gap would avoid an unduly monolithic effect being created. Overall, the design would not appear as a visually discordant feature to the host dwelling or the DCA.

8. The rear elevation of Westholme contributes little to the significance of Westholme and the DCA. The side/rear extension would broadly follow the overall form, layout, height and location of what it would replace and would be of a contemporary and simplified design. Set to the side, the extension would be subservient and would not dominate, or be at odds with the fenestration, or the rear elevation of Westholme. Due to its siting and limited scale, it would have a neutral impact on the heritage significance of Westholme and the DCA.
9. I acknowledge that the consistent use of traditional materials contributes to the significance of a conservation area. However the existing materials do not integrate well with the character of Westholme and the DCA. The proposed materials would not be in accordance with those set out in the DCA Management Plan. Whilst there would be a new type of materials/colour which is not found within the host property, they would be similar in tone and colour to Bowdon Brick whilst reflecting the modernisation of the development. They would not be so discordant to warrant refusal of the appeal scheme. Nor would they erode the significance of Westholme as a non designated heritage asset.
10. Accordingly the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property nor the character and appearance of the DCA. Thereby it would preserve the character and appearance of the DCA. Consequently, it would not conflict with Policies JP-P1 and JP-P2 Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and Policy R1 of the Trafford Core Strategy. Together these policies require new development to take account of surrounding building styles, landscape and the historic distinctiveness and to conserve and enhance the historic environment in accordance with national policy. It would also not materially conflict with the design objectives of the Management Plan for the DCA or the Council's Supplementary Planning Document A Guide to House Extensions and Alterations. The proposal would also comply with the Framework which requires development to be sympathetic to local character whilst enhancing the significance of heritage assets.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time and plans conditions imposed in the interests of certainty I have also imposed a condition to require the submission of sample materials and to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development is achieved. A condition in relation to the tree protection measures retained on site during construction works is also necessary.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the effect of the proposal on the DCA would be neutral. I conclude that the proposal would not conflict with the Development Plan nor the Framework. Accordingly for the reasons given, having regard to all matters raised I allow the appeal as set out in the formal decision notice above.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR