



---

## 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: 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/24/3354598**

**32 Melrose Crescent, Hale, Trafford WA15 8NL.**

- 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 Farukh Amini against the decision of Trafford Council.
  - The application Ref is 113518/HHA/24.
  - The development proposed is an application for erection of a front porch, two storey front, side and rear extension, alterations to the roof with a raise in ridge height, installation of side A/C and air source heat pump units and other associated external works including landscaping.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front porch, two storey, front, side and rear extension, alterations to the roof with a raise in ridge height, installation of side A/C and air source heat pumps and other associated external works including landscaping at 32 Melrose Crescent, Hale, Trafford WA15 8NL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 113518/HHA/24, dated 8 May 2024, 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: PL02 Rev F Proposed Plans and PL03 Rev C Proposed Site/Block Plan.
  - 3) No development shall commence until details/samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details/samples.
  - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any equivalent Order following the amendment, re-enactment or revocation thereof) upon first installation the windows in the first and second floor of the southeast and northwest elevations facing Nos 30 and 34 Melrose Crescent shall be fitted with, up to a height of 1.70m above finished floor level, non-opening lights and textured glass which obscuration level not less than Level 3 of the Pilkington Glass scale (or equivalent) and shall be retained as such thereafter.

- 5) Within three months of the development hereby approved coming into use 2no. bat boxes and 2 no.bird boxes shall be provided within the rear garden of the site.
- 6) The rating level (LAeq,T) from the air conditioning units proposed as part of this development, when operating simultaneously, shall be 5dB below the background noise level (LA90,T) at any time when measured at the nearest noise sensitive premises at the quietest time when the equipment would be operating/in use. Noise measurements and assessments should be compliant with BS 4142:2014 +A1:2019 "Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound".

### **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 course of action.
3. The Council amended the description of the development and I note that this description has been used by the agent for the appellant within the appeal documentation. I have accordingly used the same description albeit I have removed references to 'retrospective' as this is not an act of development.
4. The development comprises of a number of elements. Some of these elements have been partially constructed and the proposal is a revised scheme of a scheme approved under planning permission reference 110066/HHA/23 (the 2023 permission). The Council's concern relates to the proposed rear extension which incorporates roof alterations to enable an extension to the roof space. Accordingly I shall direct my assessment to this element of the appeal scheme.
5. At the time of my site visit construction works were taking place on the appeal site and the existing roof has been removed. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans submitted, and on which the Council made its decision.

### **Main Issue**

6. 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**

7. The appeal property, No 32 Melrose Crescent (No 32), is a detached property situated in a residential area where the predominant form is of large detached dwellings laid out in a regular pattern set back from the road. The area as a whole is highly varied in terms of the design and appearance of the dwellings and several dwellings have been substantially extended at both the front and rear in a contemporary design. The rear of the properties on this part of Melrose Crescent back onto Halecroft Park, and the far boundary of the South Hale Conservation Area (SHCA).
8. The proposal would see a redesign of the rear roof profile approved under the 2023 permission to accommodate a crown roof with a cross gable and second storey

apex window. The proposed extension to the rear would be significant in size. However, the ridge, though higher than the original ridge, would be the same height as that approved under the 2023 permission. Whilst the crown roof would be a feature not commonly seen in the area, No 23 would be of a scale and depth able to accommodate it. The crown roof would not be an conspicuous feature and would have the appearance of a hipped roof in views from both Melrose Crescent and Halecroft Park. Rather than creating an unduly boxy appearance, the rear gable would break up the massing of the roof and reduce any visual impact.

9. The rear of the dwellings along this part of Melrose Crescent are diverse in appearance and gables, dormer windows, and apex fenestration features can be found on neighbouring properties. The proposed alterations would increase the bulk of No 32 at its rear and introduce fenestration which would not directly reflect the design of the neighbouring properties. However given the diverse appearance of neighbouring dwellings these changes would not appear overly discordant in views from Halecroft Park, nor would they result in a dwelling which would not relate to others in the area. The form of the original dwelling as a result of the 2023 permission has altered significantly and I am not therefore persuaded that these further changes would be materially harmful to it nor the area's appearance.
10. Reference has been made to other roof extensions elsewhere on Melrose Crescent. I note that the Council say that these are of a more traditional design than the proposal before me and that their forms complement the main roof and allow for views of the main ridge. Nonetheless, notwithstanding the introduction of the crown roof and the associated roof alterations, I am not persuaded that the appeal proposal would be dissimilar to these other approvals for substantial extensions and remodelling to large properties which has resulted in a mix of designs and features evident in the local area.
11. I note that the Council do not raise any concerns in relation to the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties subject to the imposition of conditions as to obscure glazing and noise levels of the proposed A/C units. Whilst concerns have been raised in relation to parking levels and the impact on the drainage network I note that the proposed parking and drainage provision is considered proportionate to the size of the extended property. I agree with the Council in relation to these assessments.
12. The property lies outside the SHCA. Within the SHCA 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 Framework states that great weight should be attached to the conservation of designated heritage assets, in this case the SHCA. The Framework defines the setting of a heritage asset as "the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced". Separation distances from the rear site boundary of No 32 are sufficient to ensure that the proposal would not impact on the significance of the SHCA, and would not materially alter how the SHCA is experienced. Nor given separation distances and substantial vegetation between No 32 and the Grade II listed building, Halecroft, is the proposal considered to cause harm to the setting of the latter. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with the heritage policies within the Local Plan, nor the Framework.
13. Accordingly, the development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area. Consequently, it would accord with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Local Plan (adopted

March 2024) and the Trafford Council A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document. Together these require development to respect the character and identity of the locality and to be of a high standard of design. It would also accord with the design objectives of the Framework.

### **Other matters**

14. I appreciate the concerns raised by third parties in relation to general construction issues and access by emergency vehicles. Whilst the construction process is likely to result in noise and general disturbance, unrestricted on street parking would be available for construction vehicles. Further, construction would be short term and is not a reason to withhold permission. These other matters therefore do not lead me to a different conclusion.

### **Conditions**

15. I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and to provide certainty. A condition relating to matching materials is also necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. Conditions as to obscure glazing and noise levels are necessary in the interests of residential amenity and for the provision of bat and bird boxes in the interests of ecology.

### **Conclusion**

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed as set out in the formal decision notice above.

*K Winnard*

INSPECTOR