



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2025

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/24/3348667

3 Cromwell Road, Stretford, Manchester M32 8GH

- 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 Mrs Elizabeth Horwich against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref is: 113160/HHA/24.
 - The application is for remodelling of existing bungalow; erection of first floor to provide living accommodation in roofspace including raising of ridge/roof height including new dormers to front and rear, new velux rooflights to rear and side elevation, new front canopy roof over front door and single storey rear extension with roof as continuation of new roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the remodelling of existing bungalow; erection of first floor to provide living accommodation in roofspace including raising of ridge/roof height including new dormers to front and rear, new velux rooflights to rear and side elevation, new front canopy roof over front door and single storey rear extension with roof as continuation of new roof as per application reference 113160/HHA/24 subject to the following conditions;
 - i) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - ii) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building.
 - iii) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans; 202402/SkC1 proposed plans, elevations, sections, 202402/SkC2 Scheme proposals front elevations/street scene and 202402/OS2 Block Plan.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Procedural Matter

3. Since the determination of this application a revised National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was published on 12 December 2024 whose main

focus was not directly relevant to this appeal. Nevertheless, I have determined this appeal in accordance with the revised provisions within the Framework.

4. The description of development used in the heading above differs from that used on the original application form and instead the description is that as used by the Council on their decision notice. I consider that the description of development still accurately reflects the proposal before me and as such I have used this description accordingly.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached bungalow of red brick and pantile design with lawned gardens to the front separated from the roadside by a low brick wall and railings. The bungalow is of two bays with protruding right hand bay that is covered by a slightly protruding hipped roof. To the side there is an existing garage also sporting a similar hip. The rear of the property contains a fairly slim sized rear garden that backs onto the extended gardens of nearby properties that front onto Edge Lane.
6. The bungalow is sited on a plot that is opposite the Longford Park Conservation Area (CA) that encompasses the historic grounds of Longford Hall and the home of John Rylands. The majority of the park is visually separated by a row of older persons accommodation known as Park View Court. There is also the former lodge house to the estate that sits not far away on the corner of Edge Lane and Cromwell Road. Around 25 metres from the site is the Grade II Listed Former Union Baptist Chapel that fronts onto Edge Lane.
7. Other than this the majority of the streetscene here is a true mix of building styles and ages with the most consistent features being the use of red brick, partial use of render and simple gable forms, mostly upon two storey houses. The character therefore is very much one of inner city early suburban development where semi detached houses were becoming more prominent and a mix of architectural styles emerging from the Arts and Crafts Movement were being utilised.
8. The proposal before me seeks permission to raise the roof of the existing bungalow effectively creating a 1.5 storey building with two partial dormers to the front and a long cat slide type element to the rear. The building would maintain the same materials of red brick and pantile and the main difference would be the insertion of the higher level, dormers and a rear extension.
9. In considering whether to grant planning permission I am required by Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to show 'special regard' when assessing proposals for development that may affect a listed building or its setting. Similarly, Section 72 of the same act requires me to show 'special attention' to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Longford Park Conservation Area. This is reflected in The Framework, which states that 'great weight' should be given to a heritage assets' conservation and also illustrates the positive contribution that heritage assets can make to the creation of sustainable and economically viable communities.
10. In terms of the effect of the proposal upon the designated heritage assets I consider that the character and appearance of this part of Cromwell Road is

significantly different to that of the special architectural and historic characteristics that make up the Longford Park CA. The most obvious visual linkage is that between the former lodge house of the estate and the appeal site. However, the lodge building clearly sits within its historic context as a gateway into a wider landscaped park and the other (the appeal property) is clearly related to the more suburban residential development of Cromwell Road.

11. Similarly, although technically within the wider setting of the Grade II Listed Former Union Baptist Chapel, the actual contribution of this site to that building is negligible.
12. In terms of impact, the bungalow would indeed raise from a modest single storey scale to one of a higher building. However, it would still maintain subservience within the streetscene, a consistency of materials and would in some ways echo more Arts and Crafts traditions through the low hipped eaves and partial dormer windows. Even though these windows are slightly offset from the ground floor this adds to what becomes a triangular composition that could be seen to work here.
13. Ultimately, the existing bungalow is of no tangible significance or importance either to the nearby historic assets nor to the character of the streetscene to which it belongs. Through the formulated design approach, the proposal before me appears to be contextual and would have the potential to offer a modest enhancement of the street here.
14. As such I find no harm to the historic environment, nor the setting of the Grade II Listed Building. Equally I do not find harm to the character of the streetscene and consider that the above scheme would be able to meet the criteria of Policies JP-P1 and SPD4 of the Places for Everyone Local Plan aswell as the aspirations for good design as contained within The Framework.

Conclusion

15. As such, for the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I allow the appeal subject to the conditions as set out above.

A Graham

INSPECTOR