



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2024

by **Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/24/3350447

27 Plantin Road, Altrincham, Trafford WA14 4YU

- 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 Helen Flinton against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref is 113244/HHA/24.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey side (rear) extension and conversion of loft space to form additional dwelling accommodation including amendments to the front (side) elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Number 27 Plantin Road is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located within a modern housing development which is comprised of dwellings of a similar attractive design, form, and use of materials. Permitted development rights have been removed for the buildings within the development. The dwellings are largely unaltered and as a result have an overall harmonious appearance. The appeal building is situated at the edge of the development next to the bank of the Bridgewater canal and has a small rear garden. There are large industrial buildings located on the opposite side of the canal.
4. The Council considers that the proposal would not have any unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of any neighbouring dwellings. I see no reason to disagree in view of the spatial relationship with the neighbouring dwellings and separation distances involved. The Bridgewater canal is a non-designated heritage asset. However, I consider that the development proposals would not harm its significance in view of their comparatively limited extent.
5. There would be minimal change to the elevation facing Plantin Road, although the proposed new window in the apex of the gable would be out of character with the simple gable design of adjacent properties. The appeal building is closer to the canal than most of the buildings in the development. It has a main elevation, with an entrance porch, which faces the canal. This elevation and other buildings in the estate would be visible from the canal towpath.

6. The elevation facing the canal would have a new gabled extension. The appellant has referred to examples of other nearby dwellings with gabled rooflines which face the canal, including 24 Plantin Road. However, the gables on those buildings, and others within the estate, are part of projections forward of the buildings rather than being flush with the elevation as proposed. The examples cited have characteristic pale rendering in the apex of the gables rather than matching brickwork in the case of the proposal. They do not have rooflights or an extended window, as proposed, in order to create a feature staircase opening, although the appellant has advised that the design of the window could be reconsidered. Overall, the proposed elevation facing the canal would not be harmonious in appearance with the other examples provided by the appellant.
7. The Council's reasons for refusal included the proposed single storey side extension. The flank elevation of the extension would also face the canal and would fail to reflect the form and design of the dwelling and development elsewhere on the housing development because of its simple form and flat roof.
8. I find that the proposed development would appear prominent from the canal towpath and would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area. It would conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations. This indicates that it is important that an extension fits in with its surroundings by not only complementing the dwelling but also the street scene that it sits within. It adds that extensions should harmonise with other residential development in the vicinity, in terms of scale and design, spacing within the plot, and the prevailing architectural design. It would conflict with policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan which seeks to ensure that development respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design. The proposal would also fail to comply with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.
9. There are no other considerations sufficient to outweigh my findings that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area and the conflict with the development plan as a whole.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR