



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: 24 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3361019

25 Ravenwood Drive, Hale Barns, WA15 0JA

- 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 Mr Pipir Khan against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application reference is 113698/HHA/24.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing conservatory and side extension. Erection of part two storey/part single storey front extension and single storey side extension, part two storey/part single storey rear extension and loft conversion with formation of side and rear dormer. Garage conversion to habitable conditions. Associated external alterations including new windows, roof lights, removal of chimney and roof alterations.
-

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.

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 and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. There are several elements to the appeal proposal as outlined within the development description above. The refusal reason before me is specific in its application to the proposed front gable extensions, fenestration size and the side and rear dormers as a whole. The Council's delegated report confirms that the single storey front extension and the rear extension would be considered acceptable in terms of scale and design as well as that they would not dominate the host dwelling. Based upon the evidence before me, and my site visit, I have no reason to conclude differently on these elements in isolation. This appeal will, therefore, focus upon the front gable extensions, fenestration size and side and rear dormers in the context of the main issues outlined above.
5. The appeal site is a two-storey detached property, with a hipped roof, which has previously been extended (two storey) to the side with a single storey extension and conservatory to the rear. At the time of my site visit I found that the properties within close proximity of the appeal site, alongside which the appeal proposals would be viewed, are generally detached properties of a similar design (particularly

with regard to roofs) to the host dwelling at the appeal site. I note that some of the properties within the general vicinity have been extended, however, I find that the works have generally been undertaken in a manner that is consistent with the character of the area as a result of utilisation of hipped roofs as well as retention of two storey curved bay windows on the principal elevation. I find that such features form a noticeable part of both the general character and appearance of the properties within the area. Overall whilst I acknowledge some alterations to properties along Ravenwood Drive I find that there are a notable proportion of properties sharing similar architectural characteristics which are an important part of the street scene, character and appearance.

6. During my site visit I noted that some property alterations have been undertaken which are perhaps more modern by comparison to the characteristics outlined above – as are noted within the appellant's statement of case. However, based upon the evidence before me and what I saw at the time of my site visit I do not find that those alterations are comparable to the cumulative proposals that are before me with particular regard to the proposed front gable extensions, fenestration sizing and the side and rear dormers as a whole. I also note that there are examples, within the vicinity of the appeal site, of dormer windows being present within the street scene but again there are no examples that I find to be comparable to the cumulative scale and design at roof level which is the subject of this appeal.
7. The two storey front extensions would form two gable elements on the front elevation of the host property that could be considered appropriate in scale in the most basic of terms. There are examples of gable projections along Ravenwood Drive which, whilst different, have generally integrated without being entirely alien or a disrespectful feature to the host dwellings in question. Despite this, each case should be considered on its own merits and, in the case before me, the windows proposed on the two gable elements would be much larger than the existing windows/the windows which would be on the remainder of the front elevation. The extensive use of glazing proposed within the gable elements would appear disproportionate and inappropriate by design on the principal elevation and I find that this would make the two storey front extensions present as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling itself and when viewed in the context of/in visual comparison to properties in the immediate vicinity.
8. The proposed alterations to the rear of the roof would, ultimately, leave the main rear roof plane illegible. The proposed rear dormer would only set back from the eaves marginally and furthermore it would not be sufficiently set in from the sides of the roof. This, combined with its design and other alterations as part of the overall proposals, would result in a top-heavy structure which would be visually disproportionate to the host dwelling. The proposal, as a result of excessive mass and design with respect to the rear dormer, would be inappropriate in its domination of the main roof to the detriment of the design and character of the host dwelling. This would be further combined with two side dormers of notable scale and mass.
9. The proposed side dormers are noted to have been designed to be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling, however, when viewed from the front elevation within the street scene their scale would result in a prominent addition which would be incongruous and out of keeping with the host dwelling, the surrounding street scene and the general character and appearance of the area. I note, as outlined above, that there are examples of dormer windows within the vicinity of the appeal

site, however, none of the scale and placement as is before me within this appeal. Whilst the proposed extension and dormer features would not extend beyond the existing footprint of the dwelling, nor outside of the existing roof plain, the proposals would result in a bulky, top heavy, set of alterations which would dominate the host property and in particular the rear roof plane as outlined. I find that cumulatively the alterations at roof level would be disproportionate as a result of their scale, mass, design as a whole. The proposals would be disproportionate and incongruous in the context of the host dwelling, and I find that this would result in property with alien features and alterations, as a result of cumulative proposals, which would harm the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding area.

10. As outlined above, I have acknowledged the more contemporary design of some properties within Ravenwood Drive which the appellant notes as being property 26 and 43, respectively. I do not find that contemporary design itself is a sufficient reason to warrant refusal, however, as outlined within the Council's refusal reason the cumulative alterations and extensions at roof level I find would be incongruous as a result of scale, mass and design which I do not find to be the same, or comparable, to the examples of more modern design highlighted by the appellant.
11. I understand the appellant's reasoning and purpose for the proposed changes to the host dwelling, however, I do not find that such circumstances are sufficient to outweigh the notable harm which I have identified to the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the street scene as a result of the proposed roof alterations cumulatively. I do not find that on this occasion the proposals would achieve a balanced approach to achieving amended and/or extended accommodation as required by the appellant due to the proposal failing to appropriately respect the general form and scale, and design characteristics, noted to be found within the street scene. I do not doubt that, taking into account other properties within Ravenwood Drive as noted, that there is some scope for more contemporary alteration and extension as has occurred to some extent within the vicinity, however, for the reasons set out I find that cumulatively the current proposals before would be inappropriate for the host dwelling.
12. The proposal would be contrary to Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document 2024 Policy JP-P1 which requires that all development respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used. 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 (SPD) which advises that it is important that extensions should reflect the character, scale and form of the original dwelling by matching and harmonising with the existing architectural style and detailing. The SPD goes on to confirm that extensions should respect the scale and proportion of the original dwelling and should not dominate through excessive size and/or prominent siting as well as it being important that an extension fits in with its surroundings by not only complementing the dwelling but also the street scene that it sits within. 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.
13. The proposal would be contrary to paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (the Framework) which seeks to ensure that developments are

sympathetic to local character as well as adding to the overall quality of the area. Paragraph 139, of the Framework, outlines that development that is not well designed should be refused especially taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents. Whilst it is noted that it also advises that significant weight should be given to outstanding or innovative design, this weight is on the basis that such proposals fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings. In this case, for the reasons set out above, I do not find that the proposal is fairly described as particularly innovative nor that it would fit in with the overall form and layout of the surroundings as outlined.

Conclusion

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

Eleni Marshall

INSPECTOR