



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2025

by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/24/3355347

61 Norris Road, Sale, Trafford M33 3GR.

- 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 Miss and Mr Christina and Richard TerHorst and Willan against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref is 113822/HHA/24.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor side extension above existing garage, roof alterations including increasing of ridge height by 900mm and application for single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. In December 2024, the Government published its revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a cause of action.
3. The development comprises of a number of elements. Approval has already been given under planning reference 106072/HHA/21 for the erection of a first floor side extension, conversion of the loft and raising of the ridge height together with consent for a ground floor side and rear extension which had already been constructed under planning application 87257/HHA/15 but not in accordance with the approved plans.
4. The Council has raised no concerns in relation to those elements of the proposal unchanged since the previous approval. Their concern relates to the increase of the ridge height by 900mm to accommodate the conversion of the loft space. Accordingly, I shall direct my assessment to this element of the appeal scheme.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property, No 61 Norris Road, (No 61) is situated in a well established residential area characterised by dwellings of a similar traditional architectural style. No 61 is a detached dwelling in a row of other detached and semi-detached dwellings. In this location, development is of a more modest scale to the larger detached properties found elsewhere on Norris Road and nearby roads.
7. The proposal would see an increase in the ridge height of 900mm with an associated change of roof pitch. A flat section at the apex of the roof would be created enabling a loft extension within the extended roof space. The proposal would increase the size of the property considerably by raising the height of the dwelling which as a result would be significantly more imposing. The resultant roof profile and mass would result in an overly dominant dwelling which would be taller and out of scale with its neighbouring dwellings. As such the proposal would be out of keeping with the site and immediate street scene and would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.
8. The Council has already given approval for the ridge height to be raised by 300mm which would see the ridge height matching that of its neighbouring property at No 59 Norris Road. I do not agree that the proposed increase of a further 600mm would make a minimal difference upon the host dwelling and the streetscene. The increased height would be significantly more imposing within the immediate street scene and would result in the dwelling being more prominent particularly in views of the east elevation when travelling westwards along Norris Road.
9. I acknowledge that there is a wide variety of roof massing and form in properties along Norris Road and Ferndale Road and that No 61 is modest in terms of its scale relative to the larger detached dwellings found elsewhere in the wider area. However, No 61 is not seen in the context of these larger detached dwellings. From where the development would be seen in views along Norris Road, the bulk and mass of the extended dwelling would stand out as unduly prominent and relate poorly to the character and appearance of existing development within the immediate locality.
10. Therefore I have found that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. Accordingly it would not accord with Policy JP-PR1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (adopted 2024) which amongst other things seeks to ensure that development respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design. It would also not accord with the principles of the Council's A guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations which provides for extensions to not only complement the dwelling but also the street scene it fits within. Nor would it comply with the design objectives of the Framework.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would have a harmful effect on the host dwelling and character and appearance of the area. There are no other considerations which outweigh these findings or the conflict with the Development Plan. Accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR