



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2025

by **Eleni Marshall BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3360897

39 Mayfield Road, Timperley, Trafford, WA15 7TD

- 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 Laura O'Neill against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application reference is 114309/HHA/24.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing side extension, front porch, rear bay and side dormer. Erection of covered porch and a part single part two-storey side and single-storey rear extension. Alterations to roof including hip-to-gable extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the Council's description of the proposal as I find that it more concisely describes the proposal. I note that during the application process a flat roofed dormer was removed from the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the design and character of the host dwelling as well as the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two storey, semi-detached, residential dwelling which benefits from a front porch, attached garage to the side elevation, and a dormer to the side elevation of the dwelling that extends from the ridge of the main dwelling. The proposal seeks to demolish the existing side extension, side dormer, front porch, rear bay window and erect a covered porch, part single, part two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. It is also proposed to convert the hipped roof to a pitched roof. Therefore, there are several elements to the appeal proposal, as noted in the development description above.
5. The refusal reason before me is specific in its application to the proposed alterations to the existing roof and proposed roof design of the side extension, as confirmed within their delegated report. In that regard, the Council raise no refusal reason based upon the proposed rear extension, the proposed single storey side extension nor the single storey front extension/covered porch. Based upon my site visit, and the evidence before me, I have no reason to conclude differently on these particular elements, and the main issues I have considered in the context of this appeal are based upon the proposed alteration to the existing roof, and in particular its interaction, cumulatively, with the proposed roof design of the side extension.

6. I note that the adjacent dwelling (the other half of the semi-detached pair), 37 Mayfield Road, has already been extended. Whilst the existing side dormer at the host dwelling is highly visible within the street scene, the original hipped roof remains visually legible and is therefore consistent with the character of the street scene and prevalence of hipped roofs. Despite this, as evidenced by the appellant and as seen as part of my site visit, I am aware that properties within the locality have undergone extension and alteration including that at roof level (in the form of hip to gable extensions), and that this can be combined with the presence of a realistic fallback position under Class B¹ (which is reliant on timings of work as noted in email correspondence from the Council with the appellant) as material consideration to which I attribute weight.
7. On this basis, I find that a hip to gable extension would result in the original hipped roof being lost in terms of legibility, but that ultimately the principle of this element is acceptable on the basis that it would unlikely have a greater impact on the character of the locality, the host dwelling, nor the semi-detached pair than that which could be carried out under permitted development. It would be unreasonable for me to not acknowledge such a position and/or refuse the proposal based upon design grounds for that element. This could reasonably be implemented in the event this appeal failed, and furthermore the appellant is noted to have previously obtained a Certificates of Lawfulness for matters including such an alteration.
8. The proposed two storey side extension would project from the side elevation of the host dwelling in the region of 2.75 metres, and would have a pitched roof which would have an eaves height to match the host dwelling, although there would be a notable reduction in ridge height by comparison. The notable reduction in ridge height, combined with the proposed hip to gable conversion, I find would be inappropriate by design. The prevailing character within the vicinity sees properties with hipped roofing. Whilst I note examples of hip to gable extensions and find that element (the hip to gable extension) acceptable in isolation, in the context of this appeal for the reasons set out above, cumulatively I find that the hip to gable extension and the roof design of the side extension would be incongruous within the street scene, and create a block like alien feature at roof level which I find would negatively stand out within views from within the surrounding locality.
9. 37 Mayfield Road is acknowledged to have undergone significant extension which has elongated its width and unbalanced the existing pair of dwellings. Despite this, and as outlined, most notably the extensions have retained and carried through the existing roof form with the hipped roof, characteristic of the area, remaining legible. Whilst the existing pair of properties, within which the appeal site stands, is already unbalanced, I do not find that this existing imbalance justifies the proposal before me in design terms – the proposal would appear out of character for the existing dwelling and wider street scene in a manner which I find to be sufficient to warrant refusal in this case. Even if I had agreed with the appellant that that application permitted poor quality, mismatched materials and further detracted from the dwellings character, this would not be justification to allow further poor-quality development.
10. I acknowledge the fallback position, as previously outlined, in relation to Class B, but even attributing weight to this fallback position, I do not find that this overcomes

¹ The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2016 Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B (additions etc to the roof of a dwellinghouse)

or would justify the interaction between that element of the appeal proposal and the proposed roof design of the side extension as outlined. The lack of symmetry itself, in the context of the appeal site, is insufficient to warrant refusal; however, I find that the interaction of the hip to gable extension and the roof design of the side extension would appear as incongruous, out of character, and visually dominant additions to the dwelling within the street scene, and would be contrary to the visual appearance and character of the wider street scene, even taking into account the acknowledged examples of roof alterations within the locality (none of which, cumulatively, are comparable to the proposal before me).

11. The proposal would be contrary to the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document 2024 Policy JP-P1, which requires that development should respect and acknowledge the character and identity of the locality in terms of design. The proposal would also be contrary to the guidance set out within Supplementary Planning Document 4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations 2012, which seeks to ensure that side extensions are appropriate in terms of character with the original style and scale of the dwelling, and should not consist of an awkward roof detailing. The SPD also requires that extensions be in keeping with the prevailing pattern of residential development and generally be appropriate to the original dwelling. The National Planning Policy Framework 2024 is clear that proposals should be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

12. I note that the appellant has stated that one of their grounds for appeal is poor advice from the Council. This is noted, as are the emails in appendix 1 and general engagement with the Council. I can appreciate the appellant's frustration in light of the differing views of officers; however, the conduct of the Council within the determination process of the application itself is not realistically within the scope of this appeal, which is not accompanied by an application for costs. The proposal falls to be considered on its own merits against the Local Plan, taking into account material considerations, as I have within the main body of this decision letter.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Marshall

INSPECTOR